This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

ANDOVER-HARVARD LIBRARY
AH 4UIS L
Harvard Deposit
Britt

S911

יהוה
INSTITVTIO THEOLOGICA
ANDOVER. FVNDATA MDCCCVII.
Ps. CXIX. 169.
כדברך הבינני
JOH. XVII. 17.
ὁ λογος ὁ σος αληθεια εστι
ΑΚΡΟΓΩΝΙ
ΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ.

3.4.6
24.80

DISCOURSES

CONCERNING

THE TRUTH

OF THE

CHRISTIAN RELIGION;

AND

REMARKS

ON

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

BY THE LATE REVEREND

JOHN JORTIN, D.D.

ARCHDEACON OF LONDON, RECTOR OF ST. DUNSTAN'S IN THE EAST, AND VICAR OF KENSINGTON.

VOL. II.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR JOHN WHITE, FLEET-STREET,

By RICHARD TAYLOR *and* CO. *Shoe Lane.*

1805.

TO THE

MOST REVEREND

THOMAS,

LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

MY LORD,

If I accost your Grace, not with modern politeness, but with antient simplicity, the subject in which I am engaged, and the course of my studies, will, I hope, plead my excuse.

I am indebted, my Lord, to an illustrious person for unsolicited favours; favours valuable in themselves, but made doubly so by the giver, by the manner, by being conferred upon one who had received few obligations of this kind, and by settling him amongst those whom he hath great reason to love and to esteem; and I appeal, not to your Grace, but to all others, whether I should be excusable, if I neglected or delayed to publish this *acknowledgment*, which I cannot send forth without a warm though perhaps a vain wish, that it may be as lasting as it is sincere.

The discourtesies which we experience, are things too common and too insignificant to deserve a place in our memory or in our writings: it is best to bury them in eternal oblivion, and in their room to substitute the good offices of our friends, which ought to be remembered and recorded with pleasure. These *testimonies* of our *gratitude* should accompany the *offspring* of our *invention* and *in-*

dustry, that both may descend hand in hand to posterity, and either live together, or die together.

The ecclesiastical miracles, after the days of the apostles, and the authority of the fathers and historians upon which they depend, have been a subject of contention. This hath produced two opposite parties; and I cannot flatter myself with the hopes of pleasing either the one or the other.

However, since what is offered upon this head in the following Remarks, is only an appendage; and the principal intention of the whole is to defend and recommend Christianity, which is daily assaulted and insulted, the attempt, at least, may claim the approbation of all candid judges, and is not unworthy of your Grace's countenance and protection; happy if it should be instrumental in instructing or amending any who have deviated from the sacred paths of truth and duty!

Permit me, my Lord, to make a transition from my patron to the rest of my readers, and to inform those who may think this Address deficient in the most essential part, in the part where modern writers usually employ all their skill, that it was a custom amongst the antients, *not to sacrifice to heroes till after sun-set.*

I am, my Lord,

Your Grace's most obedient

and most humble servant,

JOHN JORTIN.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Remarks upon miracles in general	1
Notions of Van Dale and Le Clerc concerning them	1
The opinion that God alone can work miracles, not probable	2
The miracles of our Saviour and of his apostles defended	2
Quadratus, his testimony concerning miracles	3. 95
A passage in Tertullian corrected	4
The miracles of Christ were of a prophetic nature, and represented future events	8, &c.
One of St. Paul's miracles of the same kind	13
Difference between the writers of the N. T. and the writers of legends	7
Reasons for which our Saviour cast out evil spirits	8
Remarks on the dæmoniacs	8. 92. 98. 109
St. Paul, an emblem perhaps of the Jewish nation	14
An answer to the objection made from the miracles of false Christs	15
The apostles seem to have wrought miracles only when they were moved by the Holy Spirit	16
Recapitulation of the arguments in behalf of Christianity	17. 20
General remarks on the miracles said to have been wrought after the apostolical days, in the second and third centuries	20. 33
These miracles not to be compared, in point of evidence, with the miracles of Christ and the apostles	20
The arguments which may be alleged in favour of them	20. 22
Objections which may be made to them	22
Some of them not improbable	24. 26
Constancy of the martyrs may be ascribed to a divine assistance	24. 146. 150
The doctrine of a particular Providence maintained by Woolaston and Le Clerc	26. 28
The miracles after Constantine deserve no credit	28
Van Dale, Moyle, and Le Clerc; their notions of the miracles after the days of the apostles	28. 31
Middleton not singular in rejecting these miracles	30
Le Clerc's character of Van Dale and Moyle	32
The Christian miracles of different ages: how far credible, or not	32, 33
The improbable story of Abgarus	33
The conversion of the inhabitants of Edessa	34
The Æthiopians instructed by the eunuch	34
Miracles wrought by apostolical men	34. 36

dustry, that both may descend hand in hand to posterity, and either live together, or die together.

The ecclesiastical miracles, after the days of the apostles, and the authority of the fathers and historians upon which they depend, have been a subject of contention. This hath produced two opposite parties; and I cannot flatter myself with the hopes of pleasing either the one or the other.

However, since what is offered upon this head in the following Remarks, is only an appendage; and the principal intention of the whole is to defend and recommend Christianity, which is daily assaulted and insulted, the attempt, at least, may claim the approbation of all candid judges, and is not unworthy of your Grace's countenance and protection; happy if it should be instrumental in instructing or amending any who have deviated from the sacred paths of truth and duty!

Permit me, my Lord, to make a transiti[illegible] my patron to the rest of my readers, [illegible] form those who may thi[illegible] Add[illegible] in the most essen[illegible] dern writers [illegible] was a cu[illegible] *to her*[illegible]

JORTIN.

Page
Justin M. of opinion that miraculous gifts had been continued down to his time - - 36
St. John, his being put in a vessel of boiling oil a dubious story - - - 36, 37
Whence it might arise - - - 37
Oil not used in baptism till after the days of Justin - 37
Tertullian very credulous - - 37, 38
His character - - 40. 85. 89. 105
Papias an injudicious man. Whether an Ebionite - 38
The Epistle of Tiberianus to Trajan a forgery - 39
Remarks on the apologists and their writings - 39—44
Quadratus, Aristides, Athenagoras, Melito - 39, 40
Christians not forbidden to read certain books - 41
The Apologies seen in all probability by some emperors, and serviceable to the Christian cause - 39—44
The character of Adrian - - - 39—44
The account which he gives of the Ægyptians - 41
His rescript to Minucius - - - 42
He was no enemy to the Christians - - 41, 42
Severus Alexander a friend to the Christians - 42
No images in Christian churches till after Constantine 42
The miserable state of the Jews under Adrian - 44
Aquila. The account given of him by Epiphanius 44
Fabulous miracles related by Epiphanius - 45, 46
The character of this Father - - 44, 45. 108. 128
Orosius relates a false miracle - - 45
A wonder recorded by Josephus which happened before the destruction of Jerusalem - - 46
Plutarch. His silence concerning Christianity - 46
Quintilian censures the Jews - - - 47
Polycarp. Remarks on his martyrdom, &c. - 47. 49
The Epistle of the Church of Smyrna probably genuine, though possibly interpolated - - 47
Polycarp's vision - - - 47
The arching of the flames over Polycarp - 48. 54. 56
The voice from heaven - - 51
The sweet-smell which came from the pile - 52
Many miracles of this trifling kind - - 53
Miracles ascribed to monks of the fourth century - 53
The *Hirpi* walked barefoot over the fire - 55
Trials by fire and water - - 55
The story of the dove, &c. - - 57
Stories of the same kind - - 58
Conjectures concerning περιστερὰ - - 57, 58
Eusebius mentions it not - - - 59
Omits a story of the same kind in Josephus - 59
Le Clerc's opinion concerning the *dove* - - 60
A mistake of Valesius - - - 60
Polycarp's reply to the proconsul not blamable - 61

Page
The city of Smyrna ruined by an earthquake - 61
Polycarp's age - - - 61
His martyrdom well attested - - 62
The constancy of the martyrs to be ascribed to a divine assistance - - 63. 69. 90. 118. 146
The constancy of persons who were, or were called, heretics - - - 63, 64. 149, 150
Mark of Arethusa, his sufferings, and the remarks of Tillemont upon them - - - 65
Martyrologies usually romantic - - 66. 143
Acts of Perpetua antient, but perhaps adulterated - 67
The increase of Christianity in times of persecution 69
The alteration for the better which Christianity produced in those who received it - - 70
The obstacles which it overcame - - 71
Justin Martyr, his character and writings 40, 41. 68. 72—75
His account of the statue of Simon seems to be a mistake - - - 73
Obscure and worthless men deified by the Pagans even in his time - - - 73
Authority of the Fathers. It is better to defer too little than too much to it - - 75
Justin's Dialogue genuine - - - 75
Hegesippus, a writer of small credit - - 76
Encratites, their errors - - - 76
Alcibiades, the martyr, reproved for an erroneous notion - - - 76
The story of the thundering legion improbable - 77
Forged rescripts in favour of Christianity - 77
Marcus Aurelius, no friend to the Christians - 78
The martyrdom of Apollonius - - 78. 80
Roman Senate not favourable to Christianity - 79
Remarks on Lucian, Apuleius, Porphyry, and the Platonic philosophers - - - 80. 83
Lucian not an apostate - - - 80
Augustin, his doubts concerning the transformation of Apuleius - - - - 81
Mysteries of heretics and philosophers - - 81
Vigilantius ill-used by Jerom - - 82
Remarks on Jerom - 39. 82. 99. 104. 106, 107. 131. 149
Porphyry, his concessions in favour of Christianity - 82
His writings suppressed - - - 82
Plotinus, his attempt to establish Plato's Republic - 82, 83
Smyrna overthrown by an earthquake:
The generosity of Marcus Aurelius and of others on that occasion - - - 83
Bardesanes, his character and sentiments - 70. 84
Melito. Whether a prophet - - 84, 85
State of the Christians in the reign of Commodus - 85

Page
The Montanists - - - 85
Tertullian - - - 38. 40. 85, 86. 90
Proculus is said to have cured Severus with oil. Facts relating to that story - - 86. 90
Severus, his behaviour towards the Christians - 88, 89
Rutilius the martyr. His prudent and pious behaviour - - - - 90
Theophilus. Remarks on his Treatise to Autolycus - - - - 90—94
It is probable that there were no resurrections in his days - - - 92
No examples of resurrections mentioned by Clemens Romanus, Athenagoras, Tertullian, Tatian, Minucius Felix, &c. - - - 93
Pagan accounts of resurrections - - 93
A passage in Theophilus explained - - 93
Irenæus. Remarks on his account of miracles - 94—101
No resurrections in his time to be collected from his testimony - - - - 94
Nor that all Christians could work miracles - 96
Dæmoniacs, and the gift of tongues - 98—101. 109
The creed of Irenæus - - - 101
Le Clerc's remarks upon it - - - 101
Tertullian's creed - - - 102
Pantænus, a preacher of the Gospel in India - 103
Narcissus. Miracles related concerning him - 103
Fountains of oil - - - 103
Natalis. The miraculous punishment inflicted upon him for going over to heretics - - 103
Jerom whipped by angels - - - 104
Lactantius, his poverty - - - 104
The state of the Christians in the third century - 104
Of the Christian soldiers - - - 104
Paul the hermit, his Life by Jerom - - 106
The Novatians - - - 106
Origen. His character and sentiments - 106—112
His testimony concerning miracles and visions - 109, 110
Synesius - - - - 109
The story of Basilides and Potamiæna - - 110
The Platonic Trinity - - - 111. 129
Gregory Thaumaturgus. His miracles ill attested - 112—114
Said to have received a creed from the hands of St. John - - - - 112
Stories of the like kind - - - 113
An account of Manes, and of the Manichæan heresy - - - - 114—132
Antient heresies from which it was borrowed - 121
Corruptions of Christianity in the fourth and fifth centuries - - - - 76—122

Page
The Valdenses and Albigenses accused of Manichæism - - - - - 123
Antient heretics misrepresented - - 123—124
Miracles pretended to have been wrought by the monks - - - - 124
Eastern Christians great fasters - - 124, 125
Propagation of heresies no objection to the argument drawn from the propagation of Christianity - - - - 126
Strange notions of some old heretics - - 126
Eunomians not Manichæans; misrepresented by some of the Fathers - - - 126. 128
Athanasius rejected Arian baptism - - 128
A remark of Lord Shaftsbury - - 129
The Persian god Mithras - - - 129
Zoroastrian oracles impostures - - 129, 130
Manichæism conformable in some points to the Stoical doctrine - - - 130
The destruction of Arimanius and Hades - 130
Wine held in abomination by the Manichæans, and by others before them - - 131
Milton makes Satan talk like a Manichæan - 132
Weakness and inconsistency of the Manichæan hypothesis - - - - 132
Bayle confuted by Le Clerc - - - 132
Dionysius of Alexandria. His character - 132, 133
An instance of a particular providence related by him - - - - 133
The visions and revelations which he had - 134
Cyprian. His character and sentiments 104. 134. 139
Improbable miracles related by Cyprian, Macarius, and Sozomen - - - 136, 137
A wonderful stone mentioned and described in Thuanus - - - 137—139
Felix of Nola. False reports concerning his miracles - - - - - 139
Piety and charity of the Christians in the third century, and in times of distress - - 140
Goths converted to Christianity - - 140
Paul of Samosata deposed for heresies and immoralities - - - - 140
Arnobius. His conversion. A passage in him corrected - - - - 141
Antony the monk. His romantic life by Athanasius 141—143
Melchior Canus and Ludovicus Vives, their remarks on the lives of the saints - - 141—145
Modern monks. Their character - - 145
Hypsistarii, or *Cœliocolæ*; a sect of Deists - 145

Page
Diocletian's persecution, and the constancy of the martyrs - - - - 146—150
Depravation of manners amongst the Christians 146
Extraordinary events and miracles, which are said to have attended the sufferings of the martyrs - 147
Martyrdom of Romanus. False miracles relating to it - - - - 144. 147
Eusebius not the forger of them - - 147, 148
Rufinus and Jerom unfaithful translators - 149
Martyrdom of a Marcionite - - 149
Conversion of two pantomimes - - 150
The romance of the Thebean legion - 150, 151
A divine judgment on the patriarch of Seleucia - 151, 152
Milles, a Persian bishop and martyr - - 151, 152
State of the church after Constantine - - 152
Transactions during the reign of Constantine - 159
Remarks on the cross, &c. which was seen by Constantine, and which seems to have been a solar halo - - - - - 159—161
Licinius pretended to have been instructed and assisted by an angel - - - 161
Whether he were a Christian - - 161
His character - - - 124
The causes, origin, and progress of the worship of saints, martyrs, and reliques of monkery, lying wonders, austerities, vows of virginity, pilgrimages, &c. - - - 161—176
The Fathers were the encouragers of these superstitions - - - - 162
Eusebius not entirely excusable in this point 163. 165
The Consubstantialists ran much into these excesses - - - - 166
Christian saints supplied the place and the offices of Pagan deities - - - 163. 166
Monkish ignorance, austerities, and fanaticism 166. 170
The monks were not all of them saints - 170
Athanasius. His account of them - - 170
Eusebius, Constantine, Jerom, Ambrose. Their high notions of virginity and celibacy 171, 172. 176
Monks may have been sometimes misrepresented and wronged - - - 172
Miracles, for what purposes they were wrought in those times - - - 172
Whence the devil came to be painted black 167
Monks, imitators of Pagan philosophers - 169
Chelsea College. What it was designed for by James I. - - - 171
Monkish miracles preserved by tradition - 173

	Page
Character of the Ægyptians and of their monks	173
Valens an enemy to them	173
Made them serve public offices	173
How they came to be so numerous	174
Protected by the clergy, and disliked by others	174
Paula and Eustochium pious pilgrims	175
The schism of the Donatists	176
An account of the Arian controversy	177—204
Alexander excommunicates Arius and others	177, &c.
Sozomen and Theodoret give a good character to some Arian prelates	178
Alexander uses weak arguments against the Arians	179
His notions very like those of the Semiarians	179, 180
A supposed miracle in his favour	180
Jurieu. His notion that the articles of Christian faith were not understood in the three first centuries	180
Philostorgius not favourable to Alexander	180
Constantine treats the Arian controversy as frivolous	181
Valesius mistranslates the emperor's Epistle	181
Nicene council. Quarrels of these Fathers	181
General councils not infallible	181—190
Character of the councils of Constantinople and Ephesus	184
Eusebius against the ὁμοούσιος	185
Disputes about the meaning of that word	185—187
Eusebius, his sense of it	185
Council of Antioch, their strange interpretation of it	186
Le Clerc's account of general councils	187
Symeon Stylites, his notion of them	190
Summary account of the Arian controversy for forty years	190. 194
An Arian creed	191, 192
Divisions amongst the Arians	193
Apollinaris, his notion of the Λόγος	194
Pagans deride these controversies	194
Alexandrians, their scoffing temper	195
Erasmus, his judgment concerning the dispute	196
Semiarians	197
Co-eternity of the Λόγος considered	197—200
Le Clerc, his notion concerning the controversy	198
Consubstantiality, how understood by the Nicene Fathers	200—202
Scholastic and cabbalistic notions concerning it	202, 203
Abbadie, his indiscretion on this subject	203

Page
Disputes about the word *hypostasis* - - 204
State of Arianism after Constantine - - 205
The faults on both sides - - - 205
Constantine variable in his conduct towards the contending parties - - - 206
The creed of Arius - - - 206
The death of Arius, and the various opinions about it - - - - 207
Supposed to have been obtained by the prayers of Alexander of Constantinople - - 207, 208
Controversy concerning the Holy Ghost - - 208
The creed of the Semiarians - - 208, 209
The Nicene creed as it stood originally - - 209
Institution of Christian holy days - - 210
An unreasonable canon relating to marriage - 210
Constantine assisted by pretended angels - - 210
Said to have had a divine revelation to build Constantinople - - - - 211
Appoints chaplains for the army - - - 211
State of literature in his reign - - - 212
Builds many churches, palaces, &c. - - 212
His superstition - - - - 212
Is buried in a church - - - - 212
His clemency and character - - - 212, 213
Works miracles after his death - - 213
Character of the fourth century - - 214
Conversion of some Indian nations - - 214
Wonderful conversion of the Iberi - - 214—216
History of Theophilus, the Arian missionary to the Homeritæ, and of his miracles - - 217—219
Spyridon and Agapetus, supposed to have been workers of miracles - - - 219
The story of the discovery of the cross - - 219—225
Du Pin, remarks on him and his Bibliotheque - 221. 225
Paulinus, a bad witness for miracles - - 222
Paphnutius, an instance of his prudence concerning the married clergy - - - 226—227
Council of Illiberis. Its canons about usury, virginity, and against the Jews - - 227—228
An account of the ecclesiastical historians, and of Valesius their editor - - - 228—254
Eusebius. His character, and notions concerning the Arian controversy, the nature of the Son and Holy Spirit, miracles, images, &c. - 228—245
Some passages in his works corrected or explained - 228—245
Second council of Nice establishes the worship of images - - - - 224
Socrates the historian - - - 245, 246

Page
Sozomen - - - - 246, 247
Theodoret - - - - 247—252
Monkish miracles - - - 247
Theodoret's disputes with Cyril - - 248
Cyril's character - - - 221—249
Nestorian controversy - - - 249
Evagrius - - - - 251—252
Theodorus Byzantius - - - 253
Philostorgius - - - 253, 254
Remarks on the laws of Constantine - 254—266
His laws in favour of slaves, poor people, prisoners, matrons, &c. - 254. 256. 258, 259
Against crucifixion, &c. - - - 254
Against gladiators - - - 255
In favour of farmers - - - 255
Against usury - - - 255
Against rapes - - 256
Against divorces - - - 256
In favour of the clergy. Repealed afterwards by Julian - - - - 256
In favour of the church - - - 256
In favour of bishops - - 257
In favour of matrimony - - 257
Against making eunuchs - - 258
Against delators - - - 259
Against bad magistrates - - 259
Against adultery - - - 260
In favour of celibacy - - - 260
Against sacrificing - - 260
Against Ægyptian superstitions and debaucheries, &c. - - - - 260. 262
Against magic - - - 262
For the observation of the Lord's day - 262, 263
Against persecution - - - 263, 264
Against heretics - - - 264, 265
For building of churches - - 264
Against blasphemy - - - 264
Against Paganism - - - 264
Against Judaism - - 265. 317—321
The condition of natural children - - 257, 258
Miracles said to be wrought in Pagan temples 259
Herodotus explained - - - 261
A form of prayer for the soldiers - - 263
Pagan superstition of Constantine - - 265
His severity - - - 266
The accomplishment of the prophecies in the destruction of persecuting princes and magistrates, &c. - - - - 266—298

Page
Herod the Great - 266
Herod Antipas - 267
Salome - 267
Pontius Pilate - 268
Caiphas - 268
Flaccus - 269
Catullus - 269
Caius - 269
Herod Agrippa - 269
Claudius Heminianus, &c. - 269
Pheretimé - 270
Ananias - 270
Ananus - 270
Nero - 271
Domitian - 271
Severus - 271
Saturninus - 271
Heliogabalus - 272
Decius - 272
Gallus - 272
Valerian - 272
Æmilian - 272
Aurelian - 272
Maximus - 272
Diocletian - 272. 274
Severus - 274
Urbanus - 274
Firmilianus - 275
Maximianus Herculius - 275
Maximianus Galerius - 275
Maxentius - 275
Maximinus - 276
Pincentius, Culcianus, Theotecnus, &c. - 278
Licinius - 278
Julian - 278
Count Julian, Felix, Elpidius - 279
Hero, Theotecnus, Thalassius - 283
The Pagans of Heliopolis - 284
Valens - 285
Eugenius and Arbogastes - 285, 286
Radagaisus - 286
Hunneric - 288
Modern persecutors - 289
The Baron D'Oppede - 289
John the monk - 289
Lewis XI. - 289
Character of Metaphrastes - 268
Christians, how used by Trajan, Titus Antoninus, and Marcus Aurelius - 271

Page

Alteration in the form of government made by Diocletian - - - - 272. 274
Charity of the Christians - - 276
Theodosius I., miracles supposed to have been wrought in his favour - - - 285
False miracles in the fifth century - - 287
Quick succession of the Roman emperors serviceable to Christianity - - - 290
The cxth Psalm explained - - 290—298
The interpretation of Ruarus rejected - - 297
The condition of the Jews from the destruction of Jerusalem to this day - - - 298
Of the gypsies - - - - 301
T. Jackson, his account of the Jews, not impartial - 302
The false Messiahs who have appeared since the resurrection of Christ - - - 302—313
Barcochab - - - - 302. 314
Moses Cretensis - - - 302
Dunaan - - - - 303
Julian - - - - 303
Mohammed - - - 303
A Syrian Jew - - - - 303
A French Jew - - - - 303
A Persian Jew - - - - 304
A Spanish Jew - - - 304
An African Jew - - - 304
An Arabian Jew - - - 304
A Jew who dwelt beyond Euphrates - - 304
A Persian Jew - - - 304
David Almusser, &c. - - - 304
David Alroi - - - 304
Ismael Sophus - - - 305
Rabbi Lemlem - - - 305
Pfefferkorn - - - 305
Rabbi Solomo Malcho - - - 305
An Indian Jew - - - 305
One in the Low Countries - - - 306
Sabatai Sevi - - - 306
Nehemiah Cohen - - - 310
Rabbi Mordecai - - - 312
State of the Jews under Titus - - 313
Domitian - - - 314
Trajan - - - - 314
Adrian - - - - 314
Antoninus Pius - - - 315
Marcus Aurelius - - - 315
Severus - - - - 315
Constantine - - - - 315

	Page
Cruel decree of a council of Toledo	316
Jews confuted by pretended miracles	317—319
Constantine's decrees against them	317—321
Their rebellion under Constantius	321
Laws made in their favour by Valentinian I., &c.	321, 322
Considerations on Julian's attempt to rebuild the Temple	322—331
Tacitus, his account of fire issuing from the earth	324
A remarkable fountain in Poland	324
Subterraneous fires	325
The fires which have accompanied earthquakes	325, 326
Earthquakes in Palæstine	326
Story of Herod, and of Barsanuph the monk	330
God usually manifested his presence by fire	328—330
Sufferings of the Jews, and lies invented concerning them	331
Pretended miracles to expose the Jews	332. 337.
Ambrose defends the burning of a synagogue	332—335
A Jew wonderfully healed	335
Symeon Stylites defends the seizing upon the synagogues	336
Remarks on his miracles	336—337
The confessors who spake when their tongues were cut out	337
Lying miracles in the Chronicon Saxonicum	337
Agobard, his complaints against the Jews	337
Popes favourable to them	338
The council of Basil, its decrees concerning them	338—340
Improbable account of the Jews assembling in the plain of Ageda	340
Conjectures concerning the calling of the Jews, and remarks on the difficulties which attend the conversion of that people, of the Mohammedans, and of the Pagans	341—352
Limborch, his method of disputing with Orobius	348
Appendix	354
Remarks on the Præparatio Evangelica of Eusebius, and on some authors who are cited in it	354. 363
Antient oracles corrected and explained	354. 359
Ezechiel Tragicus	359
Africanus	360
Plato supposed to have borrowed some things from Moses	360
Plotinus	361
Timon Phliasius	362

REMARKS

ON

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

One of the great arguments for the truth of Christianity is taken from the miracles of our Saviour and his apostles.

It seems to be rashness for us, who know so little of the powers of intellectual and spiritual agents, and of the scheme of Divine Providence, to affirm that (the miracles of the Old and New Testament excepted) God never wrought any, or never suffered any to be wrought by spirits good or evil. It is true that fraud, and fiction, and credulity, and ignorance of natural powers, and a strong imagination, and a disordered understanding, and misguided zeal, have been the parents of ten thousand false wonders.

Van Dale rejected every thing of the preternatural kind which is related to have appeared in the Pagan world, and resolved it all into imposture, and said that there were no real miracles, any more than real predictions, except those of which God was the author: but Le Clerc, in his account of Van Dale's works, shows that this is affirming too much, and talking unphilosophically, and that we have not sufficient grounds to determine in so positive a manner. Bibl. Chois. iii. p. 106. Le Clerc might perhaps have fallen into Van Dale's opinion, to which he had a certain propensity, if he had not been a careful reader of Cudworth and Grew. These two Christian philosophers led him into another way of thinking, and suggested to him strong motives for hesitation.

A miracle is a sensible operation, contrary to the common course of nature, wrought either by the immediate act, or by the assistance, or by the permission, of God.

Miracles cannot directly prove the truth or falsehood, the

reasonableness or absurdity, of any doctrine. As they are appeals to our senses, so are doctrines to our reason. They are properly credentials and testimonials, which when a man can produce openly and fairly, if he teach nothing absurd, much more if his doctrines and precepts appear to be good and beneficial, he ought to be obeyed.

Some learned men have affirmed that God alone can work miracles; which is not to be proved by reason, nor to be reconciled with the scriptures, without giving them the torture, and stretching or paring them to the hypothesis; and the contrary notion is more prevalent. But opinions fall and rise again, and we may expect to see this discarded system set up to try its fortune once more.

This inconvenience attends it, that if every miraculous operation be ascribed to God alone, when once a miracle is judged to be well attested, all inquiries into the reasonableness of the doctrine which it was wrought to support are in a manner superseded; but in the other system, which supposes that evil spirits may work miracles as well as good ones, full leave is left to examine the doctrines, and less danger of being led astray.

But God will not permit evil spirits to delude men. Say—to delude wise and good men to their hurt; and it is true. He permits evil men to impose upon some persons by false wonders and impostures, and then, 'Homo homini dæmon:' as to the consequences, the effect is the same, and the believer is deluded, though no devil overreach him.

THE MIRACLES recorded in the New Testament recommend themselves to our belief upon the following accounts.

1. They were wrought by persons who gave other proofs of their mission, and who rest not the whole of their cause upon miracles, but insist also upon the reasonableness of their doctrines, and offer them to examination.

2. By persons who appealed to God, and declared that they would perform them. By acting in the name of the God and Father of all, they gave the best kind of proof that they were supported by him, and thereby prevented ob-

jections that the wonder might happen by chance, or be effected by a secret fatal power of which themselves knew nothing, or by evil dæmons, or for other ends and purposes; and they laid themselves under a necessity of fulfilling their promises, or of passing for impostors.

3. By persons known to be poor, unlearned, of a low condition, and destitute of great friends and powerful patrons.

4. They were performed in a public manner; which is a circumstance necessary to establish their credit: for though miracles may be wrought in secret, and cannot be disproved, only because they were seen by few, yet they often afford motives for suspicion; and a wise inquirer would perhaps suspend his assent in such cases, and pass no judgment about them.

5. The writers of the New Testament, when they relate the miracles, often name the time, the place, the occasion, the circumstances, the diseases that were removed, the persons healed or raised, the persons who were present, and the things that were said and done by friends and foes on the occasion, giving men an opportunity to inquire into the facts, and to disprove them if they were able.

Quadratus, who wrote his Apology for Christianity about A. D. 124. says that there were persons alive, even in his days, upon whom Christ had wrought miracles; and it is very probable that some of those who were cured of their infirmities, and raised from the dead, by our Saviour, were preserved by Providence to an extreme old age, to be living witnesses of his power and goodness. Apud Euseb. iv. 3.

6. They were performed before enemies, or unbelievers, or doubters, and persons not yet convinced; as indeed it was highly fit that they should; for miracles, in the main, are not so much designed for those who believe, as for those who believe not, and who are as yet undetermined, and want proper motives of persuasion.

7. They were wrought in a learned age and civilized countries, and in the politest and best inhabited parts of the world, where persons are not easily deluded, and are rather disposed to hesitate upon strange and unexpected ap-

pearances, and to examine, than to be ductile and over credulous.

8. They were accompanied with no appearance of pride, vanity, and ostentation. When a man preaches up himself, and assumes haughty airs of importance and superiority, he gives cause for suspicion. Such was the case of Simon the magician, as St. Luke represents him, who seems to have had for his principal view to pass for a very great person amongst the Samaritans. But the behaviour of the apostles, in this respect, was unexceptionable; and our Saviour, during his ministry, acted as a servant and a prophet sent from God, ascribing all his miracles to his Father.

9. They were wrought for no worldly advantage. As nothing of that kind was sought, so nothing was obtained, by our Lord and by his disciples. Obscure indeed they could not be, who were endued with such powers, and despised they could not be by their friends and followers; but these were small temporal advantages, set against the obloquy, the opposition, the injuries, the afflictions, and the sufferings which they underwent. To do good, and to receive evil, was their portion, and poverty was their lot and their choice. 'Quæ tamen passos apostolos scimus, manifesta doctrina est; hanc intelligo *solam* acta decurrens; nihil quæro; carceres illic, et vincula, et flagella, et saxa, et gladii, et impetus Judæorum, et cœtus nationum, et tribunorum elogia, et regum auditoria, et proconsulum tribunalia, et Cæsaris nomen, interpretem non *habent*.' Tertullian, Scorpiac p. 633. where instead of 'solam' it should be 'sola' or 'solùm;' and for 'habent —interpretem non avent,' or 'havent:' want not, stand not in need of an interpreter.

10. They were wrought in confirmation of doctrines good and useful to mankind. The excellence of Christian morality will not be contested by fair and candid adversaries; and the few objections which may be made to it are grounded on passages not rightly understood, nor justly interpreted.

11. They were performed at a time when men wanted neither power nor inclination to expose them if they were

impostures, and were in no danger of being called atheists and heretics, and of being insulted by the populace, and persecuted by the civil magistrate for deriding them.

12. They were various and numerous, and of a permanent nature, and might be reviewed and re-examined. When our Saviour was risen from the dead, it could not be said of him, that he appeared only like a phantom for a moment;

> 'Ostendunt terris hunc tantum fata, neque ultra
> Esse sinunt:'

for he showed himself alive to his apostles by many repeated infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days.

13. They had nothing fantastical and cruel, but were acts of kindness and beneficence, calculated to excite gratitude more than fear, and to persuade rather than to terrify. Our Saviour performed no miracles of the severe kind, and the apostles very few, and no more than were necessary for wise and good purposes.

14. They prevailed upon many persons to quit the religion in which they had been educated, and with it ease and pleasure and worldly conveniences, to give up ample fortunes, to disoblige their dearest friends and relations, to offend rulers and magistrates, to leave their country, and to suffer all kinds of temporal evils, and the loss of life.

15. They were attested by proper witnesses. The disciples of Christ saw the miracles of their master, and died in confirmation of them, particularly of his resurrection. St. Paul appeals to the church of the Corinthians, that he had wrought miracles amongst them, and that they had miraculous gifts conferred upon them by the Holy Spirit. See Disc. ii. on the Christ. Relig.

16. They were foretold by the prophets, and such as the Jews expected, and had reason to expect, from the Messias. Isaias speaks of times when miracles should be performed, and of a person who should open the eyes of the blind, and cause the lame to walk, and heal the diseased; which when Christ performed, he might justly affirm that he was the person promised by the prophet.

'Jesus said, Go and show John again those things

which ye do hear and see: the blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up,' &c. Matt. xi. 4.

'In that day shall the deaf hear the words of the book, and the eyes of the blind shall see out of obscurity, and out of darkness. The meek also shall increase their joy in the Lord, and the poor among men shall rejoice in the Holy one of Israel.' Isaiah xxix. 18, 19.

'Behold, your God will come—then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped Then shall the lame man leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing.' xxxv. 4, 5, 6.

'The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings to the meek,' &c. lxi. 1.

'I the Lord—will give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles: to open the blind eyes.' &c. xlii. 6, 7.

'He hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows.' liii. 4.

'I will feed my sheep—and will bind up that which was broken, and will strengthen that which was sick—and will set one shepherd over them, even my servant David.' Ezechiel xxxiv.

To these must be added all the prophecies which speak of the afflictions and death, and of the triumphant success and everlasting dominion, of the Messias, and were fulfilled in his resurrection, ascension, &c.

17. They were acknowledged by adversaries. Besides the confessions of that kind recorded in the gospel, and the conversion of enemies, the Jewish objection, that they were wrought by evil spirits, and the Gentile objection, that they were effected by magic arts, were a kind of confession that there was in them something preternatural.

18. The same persons whose miracles stand recorded in the gospel, foretold also many events, some of which did not come to pass till a considerable time after the books of the New Testament were written, and the writers were dead. This confirms the miracles related in those books. We have predictions there of the dispersion of the Jews, of their continuance as a distinct people, of the calling of the Gen-

tiles, of the perpetual duration of Christ's kingdom, of the fall of its enemies, of the particular corruptions which should find entrance into the Christian church, of the spiritual tyranny that should be erected, &c. See Two Previous Questions, p. 59, &c.

19. If we reflect upon the end and purpose for which these miracles were wrought, we find it grand and noble, full of dignity and majesty. It was, to carry on one vast and consistent plan of Providence, extending itself from the creation to the consummation of all things, to establish a system of belief, hope, and practice, plain and useful, being no other than the Religion of Nature improved and inforced, revealed in part to the Jews, promised by the prophets, and tending to destroy four great moral evils, so prevalent and so pernicious;—atheism, scepticism, superstitious idolatry, and vice.

Compare with these evangelical miracles, the Pagan miracles, as delivered to us by report, or the ecclesiastical miracles, after the church was supported by the state: but there is no comparison; the latter were usually such as would make fools stare, and wise men suspect; and as they began, so they ended in vain, establishing nothing, or what was worse than nothing; if false, the tricks of deceitful men; if true, the frolics of fantastical dæmons.

20. Lastly, the supposition that no miracles were wrought in confirmation of the gospel, is not to be reconciled with the character, behaviour, and patient sufferings of Christ, of his apostles, and of the apostolical Christians, or with the propagation of our religion, or with those prophetic parts of the New Testament which have been fulfilled.

Thus far we have given the sum and substance of those arguments which are usually urged in defence of the miracles recorded in the New Testament. They are the plainest and the most obvious arguments, and consequently the most useful and satisfactory. To these I shall add some proofs which are more remote from common observation, and which perhaps have not been sufficiently considered.

'Avia jam solus peragro loca, nullius ante
Trita solo.'

In few words, the observation which I would offer is this. The miracles of Christ were prophecies at the same time; they were such miracles as in a particular manner suited his character, they were significant emblems of his designs, and figures aptly representing the benefits to be conferred by him upon mankind, and they had in them, if we may so speak, a spiritual sense. So much may be urged in behalf of this interpretation of them, as shall probably secure it from being ranked amongst those 'fanciful expositions' which are generally slighted by wise men: for many 'cabbalistic notions' have made their appearance in this, as well as in other centuries and countries, which are even beneath censure or mention, and 'neither fit for the land, nor yet for the dunghill.'

Our Saviour's miracles were then of a beneficent nature, and such as might be expected from one who came to be an universal blessing.

He cast out evil spirits, who by the divine Providence were permitted to exert themselves at that time, and to possess many persons. By this he showed that he came to destroy the empire of Satan, and seemed to foretell, that wheresoever his doctrine should prevail, idolatry and vice should be put to flight.

He foresaw that the great and popular objection to him would be, that he was a magician; and therefore he confuted it before hand, and ejected evil spirits, to show that he was in no confederacy with them.

The miracle which he first wrought, and which on that account was remarkable, was his turning water into wine at a marriage-feast.

There arose in the church, from antient times, sects of heretics, who condemned wine, and the use of animal food, and marriage; and not only heretics, but the orthodox also ran into extravagant notions of the same kind, crying up celibacy and a solitary life beyond measure, together with rigid and uncommanded austerities and macerations of the body. Christ therefore, as we may conjecture, was present at this feast, and honoured it with this miracle, that it should stand in the gospel as a confutation

of these foolish errors, and a warning to those who had ears to hear, not to be deluded by such fanatics. St. John, who records this miracle, lived to see these false doctrines adopted and propagated.

He gave sight to the blind, a miracle well suiting him who brought immortality to light, and taught truth to an ignorant world. 'Lucem caliganti reddidit mundo,' applied by Q. Curtius to a Roman emperor, can be strictly applied to Christ, and to him alone. No prophet ever did this miracle before him, as none ever made the religious discoveries which he made. Our Saviour himself leads us to this observation, and sets his miracle in the same view, saying upon that occasion; 'I am the light of the world; I am come into this world, that they, which see not, might see.'

He cured the deaf, and the dumb, and the lame, and the infirm, and cleansed the lepers, and healed all manner of sicknesses, to show at the same time that he was the physician of souls, which have their diseases corresponding in some manner to those of the body, and are deaf and dumb, and impotent, and paralytic, and leprous in the spiritual sense.

He fed the hungry multitudes by a miracle; which aptly represented his heavenly doctrine, and the gospel preached to the poor, and which he himself so explains, saying, 'I am the living bread which came down from heaven;' if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever.'

The fig-tree, which with all its fair appearance was destitute of fruit, and died away at his rebuke, was plainly a figure of the Pharisaical religion, which was only outside show; and of the rejection and fall of the Jewish nation.

At his direction the disciples twice cast the net, and had an astonishing draught of fishes, when without him they had long toiled in vain and caught nothing; an image of the success which they should have when they became fishers of men, as he himself explained it.

In the miraculous draught related in John xxi. the number of fishes was one hundred and fifty-three, which, says Sam. Basnage, is the number of the sorts of fishes then known, for Oppian reckons up just so many; and this,

adds he, was an indication that persons of all nations and conditions should enter into the church. Ann. Eccl. i. p. 415. What he observes from Oppian is true. See the Miscell. Observ. ii. p. 361 [a].

His rebuking the winds and waves into silence and peace may be considered as an emblem of his spiritual victories over the mad rage of Jews and Gentiles; and his walking upon the sea seems to have been a prelude of the amazing progress of his gospel, which crossed the wide ocean, and reached the remotest lands [b].

Popular tumults are often compared to tempests, and to a troubled sea; and Cicero often mentions 'fluctus concionum,' and 'fluctus civiles.'

Κινήθη δ' ἀγορὴ, ὡς κύματα μακρὰ θαλάσσης,

says Homer.

'Who stilleth the noise of the seas, the noise of their waves, and the tumult of the people.' Psalm lxv. 7.

As in the Old Testament God's power is set forth by his commanding the sea to rage, and to be still, and to keep its bounds, &c. so the dominion which our Lord exercised over that unruly element, is an indication of the dignity of his nature, and that 'by him all things were made;' and none besides himself ever wrought this miracle.

St. Matthew says; 'The ship was in the midst of the sea, tossed with waves: for the wind was contrary.—and the wind ceased. xiv. There arose a great tempest in the

[a] The notes on Oppian, referred to here, were written by Jos. Wasse,

τοῦ δ' οὐκ ἐπιλήσομαι, ὄφρ' ἂν ἔγωγε
Ζωοῖσιν μετέω.

That learned man, with two or three others, offered his assistance very kindly to the author of the Miscell. Observations, who had not many friends to advise him and to countenance him; no small discouragements to a young writer, and no bad excuse for the defects in that work.

[b] To use the words of Pindar:

Πέταται δ' ἐπί τε χθόνα καὶ διὰ θαλάσσας τηλόθεν γ' ὄνομ' αὐτοῦ·—

Nem. vi. 81.

sea, insomuch that the ship was covered with waves: but he was asleep.—Then he arose, and rebuked the winds and the sea, and there was a great calm.' viii.

Tertullian says, 'Cæterum navicula illa figuram ecclesiæ præferebat, quod in mari, id est, seculo, fluctibus, id est, persecutionibus et tentationibus inquietatur, Domino per patientiam veluti dormiente, donec orationibus sanctorum in ultimis suscitatus, compescat seculum, et tranquillitatem suis reddat.' De Bapt. c. 12. 'The little ship tossed up and down in the sea, represented the Christian church, which suffers affliction and persecution in this world, whilst the Lord sleeps, and seems patiently to overlook it, till being awakened by the prayers of the saints, in the latter days, he shall check the raging world, and restore tranquillity to his servants.' His observation is ingenious.

Some persons have spoken of this miracle as of one which had the appearance of the least and most ambiguous of Christ's miracles, because it might have happened by chance, since storms are succeeded by calms, and calms by storms: but they are mistaken; a sudden calm is contrary to the course of nature; for, in a violent storm, the tossing and rolling of the waves continues after the wind is laid; and in this miracle, not only the wind fell, but the waters were immediately smoothed, ἐπετίμησε — τῇ θαλάσσῃ. καὶ ἐγένετο γαλήνη μεγάλη. Γαλήνη is a *smooth water.*

Seneca de Tranquill. 2. 'Sicut est quidam tremor etiam tranquilli maris, aut lacus, cum ex tempestate requievit.'

De Brev. Vit. 2. 'Velut in profundo mari, in quo post ventum quoque volutatio est.'

Herc. Fur. 1089.

'sed ut ingenti
Vexata Noto, servat longos
Unda tumultus, et jam vento
Cessante tumet.'

Herc. Oet. 710.

'Ut fractus Austro pontus etiamnum tumet,
Quamvis quiescat languidis ventis dies.'

Lucan. v. 217.

> ' ut tumidus Boreæ post flamina pontus
> Rauca gemit.'

Statius, Theb. vii. 86.

> ' Ut, si quando ruit, debellatasque reliquit
> Eurus aquas, pax ipsa tumet, pontumque jacentem
> Exanimis jam volvit hiems.'

Claudian, In Ruf. i. 70.

> ' ceu murmurat alti
> Impacata quies pelagi, cum flamine fracto
> Durat adhuc sævitque tumor, dubiumque per æstum
> Lassa recedentis fluitant vestigia venti.'

He raised the dead, a miracle peculiarly suiting him, who at the last day should call forth all mankind to appear before him; and therefore, when he raised Lazarus, he uttered those majestic words: ' I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live.'

He performed some miracles upon persons who were not of his own nation; and it was so ordered by divine Providence, that these persons, as the centurion, the Syrophœnician woman, the Samaritan leper, should show a greater degree of faith and of gratitude than the Jews to whom the same favours were granted. This was an indication that the gospel should be more readily received by the Gentiles than by the Jews; and this our Saviour intimates, saying, when he had commended the centurion's faith, ' Many shall come from the east and from the west, from the north and from the south, and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven; but the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into utter darkness.'

He cured some persons at a distance, without visiting and seeing them, to show that he should convert and save by his sacred word those who should not see and converse with him here on earth.

The darkness which was spread over the land, showed the spiritual blindness of the Jews, which continued when

the gospel shone in the Gentile world, and was an omen of their destruction.

The veil of the temple which was rent in twain from the top to the bottom, portended the abolition of the ceremonial law, and of the separation between Jews and Gentiles, and an entrance for believers by the death of Christ into the Holy of holies.

The earthquakes at the death and resurrection of Christ showed the great revolutions which should come to pass in the establishment of the gospel, and in the fall of Judaism and Paganism; for, in the sacred writers, great changes in the political world are foretold and denoted by earthquakes, by shaking heaven and earth and sea and dry land.

If Christ never wrought a miracle, and his disciples, mean and illiterate persons, feigned all these things, they were extremely ingenious to fix upon miracles which so exactly suited the character that he assumed; and amazingly fortunate to invent miracles which so aptly prefigured events that came to light in later times.

We have false legends concerning the miracles of Christ, of his apostles, and of antient Christians; and the writers of these fables had in all probability as good natural abilities as the disciples of Christ, and some of them, as the author of the *Recognitions*, wanted neither learning nor craft; and yet they betray themselves by faults against chronology, against history, against manners and customs, against morality, and against probability. A liar of this kind can never pass undiscovered; but an honest relater of truth and matter of fact is safe; he wants no artifice and fears no examination; and if the miracles related by him be found to be indications of future and remote events, this circumstance adds no small strength to his testimony.

Of the same prophetic kind was also one of St. Paul's miracles: 'At Paphos they found a certain sorcerer, a Jew—Then Paul set his eyes upon him and said—The hand of the Lord is upon thee, and thou shalt be blind for a season.—Then the deputy, when he saw what was done, believed.' Acts xiii.

By this miracle of the apostle was confirmed the prediction of Christ, 'I am come into the world, that they who see not may see, and that they who see may be blind.'

The eyes of the wicked Jew are closed, and the understanding of the Pagan proconsul is illuminated. The one represents the impenitence and the rejection of the Jews, the other the docility and the calling of the Gentiles; and as the false prophet is only condemned to blindness for a season, so the Jews are to remain in darkness for a certain period, and to be converted in God's appointed time.

Origen therefore, who was ever inclined to judge candidly, and Chrysostom, were of opinion, that the punishment which St. Paul inflicted upon the sorcerer Barjesus brought him to a sense of his guilt, and to a sincere repentance. And indeed a man must have been hardened to a strange degree, upon whom a double miracle, first of severity, and then of clemency, would have no effect. See S. Basnage, Annal. i. p. 549.

The miracles by which St. Paul was instructed and converted have been thought by some to be of the emblematic and prophetic kind, and to indicate the future calling of the Jews; so that Paul the persecutor, and Paul the apostle, was a type of his own nation.

St. Paul, though the apostle of the Gentiles, never cast off his care for his own brethren, and always expressed himself on that subject with the warmest affection; and he alone, of the writers of the New Testament, hath spoken clearly of the future restoration of the Jews: he earnestly wished for that happy day, and saw it afar off, and was glad.

St. Paul was extremely zealous for the law, and a persecutor of the Christians: so were the Jews.

St. Paul, for opposing Jesus Christ, was struck blind, but upon his repentance he received his sight: so were the Jews, for their rebellion, smitten with spiritual blindness, which shall be removed when they are received again into favour.

St. Paul was called miraculously, and by the glorious manifestation of Christ himself, and he was instructed by the same divine master: such will perhaps be the conversion and the illumination of the Jews.

St. Paul was called last of all the apostles: the Jews will certainly enter late into the church.

St. Paul was the most active, laborious, and successful of all the disciples: such perhaps the Jews also shall be after

their conversion. But these are rather conjectures of what may be, than discoveries of what must come to pass.

OUR SAVIOUR foretold that false Christs and false prophets should arise and show signs and wonders. This somewhat perplexed the antient Christian writers; but if the objection had been made to the apostles, when they first preached the gospel, they would perhaps have replied:

As to the wonders, which our master says shall be done by false Christs and false prophets;

Either upon examination some of those wonders will appear to be tricks and impostures;

Or they will not be wrought publicly and before proper witnesses, but will be attested by seditious ruffians, whose oath should not be admitted in any court of judicature;

Or they will be wrought to defend something that is manifestly false, and therefore will be of no weight;

Or they will be wrought to prove that God will protect and defend the Jews, which will be soon confuted by the destruction of Jerusalem;

Or they will not be such miracles as the antient prophets declared that the Messias would perform, miracles beneficial to mankind;

Or they will not be wrought with a declared purpose to disprove the truth of Christianity, or to establish any thing good and commendable, but only to amaze people, and excite them to rebellion;

Or they will be wrought at a time when the servants of Christ frequently and openly perform miracles of a more noble and amiable kind; so that it will be impossible for an impartial man not to see on which side the advantage lies;

Or they will be wrought by the permission of the divine Providence, to infatuate and seduce the wicked, reprobate, unbelieving Jews; for though Providence be concerned to take care that no honest person be misled by the miracles of a false prophet, yet God may by a just judgment permit evil men and evil spirits to delude those who are abandoned to all wickedness, and who have forfeited his favour and protection.

Thus you are forewarned; take heed therefore that ye be not deceived.

Christ and his apostles foretold the destruction of Jerusalem, and many other events, and wrought a variety of miracles in confirmation of their own character and authority. False Christs were to arise showing signs and wonders. Who were these false Christs? Jews, without question. And whom would they deceive? Their own countrymen. And when were they to arise? After the ascension of Christ, when his predictions began to be accomplished, and whilst his disciples were endued with miraculous powers. And what was to be the end of the wonders, real or fictitious, of the false Christs? To incite the Jews to sedition and rebellion, and to persuade them that God would never forsake them. But misery and ruin brake in upon the nation like a torrent, and showed the folly of trusting in such liars. If for a time these impostors succeeded, and seduced some persons, yet the time was short, and the deluded persons were men devoted to destruction, and so no harm arose from it, either to good men, or to the Gentile world, or to the gospel of Christ.

The destruction of Jerusalem, therefore, soon decided the controversy between the Christians and the false prophets, and showed on which side the truth lay, and who had the spirit of God.

Our Saviour says of those impostors, 'They shall show wonders.' It appears not evidently from these words that they should really work miracles. They shall show them, that is, they shall pretend to it, and make people think so, —truly or falsely, it mattered not; and Christ forbad his followers to regard any thing that they should teach, or to take their wonders into consideration, because the event would very soon discover them to be false prophets and pernicious guides, and that was enough.

Concerning the miracles of the apostles, it is most probable that they could not be performed by them at their own discretion, but only when they had an impulse from the Holy Ghost, who alone knew the proper times and

the just occasions. When St. Paul was sent as a prisoner to appear before Cæsar at Rome, it seems to have been expedient for the honour of Christianity, that he should have the reputation of being a holy man, favoured by heaven, who had the spirit of prophecy, and had performed wonderful works; or else Nero, and the courtiers, and the prætorian guards, would have despised him, as a setter forth of strange doctrines, and a fanatic. Therefore the Spirit of God so ordered it, that he foretold the loss of the ship, and the safe landing of all the passengers, and wrought several miracles at Malta, and that kind of miracles which will gain the love and favour of men, namely, healing the sick, and thence was highly respected by Julius the centurion, who had the care of him, and who, when he delivered his prisoners to the captain of the guard at Rome, informed him, no doubt, of all that had happened in the voyage; which accounts for the good treatment St. Paul received at court, and for the permission granted him of dwelling in his own hired house, with only one soldier to guard him, and for the converts whom he seems to have made even in Cæsar's household.

Let us now sum up briefly, and in few words, the main evidences of the truth of our religion.

1. Christ was foretold by the prophets. Of the things predicted concerning him, some were miraculous, some improbable, some seemingly irreconcileable, and all of them beyond the reach of human conjecture; and yet in him they all centred, and were united and reconciled.

To this must be added the amazing harmony, analogy, and correspondence between the Old and New Testament, not only in the direct prophecies, but in the types, rites, ceremonies, and events contained in the former, and fulfilled in a sublimer sense in the latter, which upon the whole could never be the effect of blind chance.

The Old and New Testament confirm each other: the prophetic parts of the former support the Gospel, and the miracles and prophecies and success of Christ and his apostles support the Old Testament[c].

[c] The authenticity of the books of the New Testament stands con-

2. Christ knew the hearts of men, as he showed upon all occasions; a knowledge which Almighty God represents in Scripture as so peculiar to himself, that he cannot be supposed to suffer those to partake of it who are not sent by him.

3. He was a prophet: he foretold not only things remote, and lying beyond human sagacity, but things improbable and miraculous, which have been accomplished.

4. He wrought miracles numerous and various, worthy of himself, and beneficial to men: and many of these miracles were also prophecies at the same time, and indications of future events; and so were most of his parables.

5. He never erred or failed in any point, as teacher, prophet, Messias, or worker of miracles. All his promises were accomplished, particularly his remarkable promise that he would support and comfort all those who should be called to suffer and to die for his sake; which hath been illustriously fulfilled in antient and in modern martyrs.

6. He conferred miraculous and prophetic gifts on his disciples, and they on theirs.

7. His religion was plain and popular, yet pure and holy, and tending to make men wiser and better, and it produced a multitude of good effects in the world.

8. When it was first preached, it could never have made its way without the assistance of miracles.

firmed by many proofs internal and external, some of which we have represented already; and the truth of the facts and doctrines contained in those books must be established by the same arguments which show the truth of Christianity.

'We know the Scriptures to be the word of God,' say some persons, 'because the Spirit tells us so.' But how will you convince us that you have the Spirit? and what is the rule by which we may distinguish your pretensions from fanaticism?

When a man carefully examines the arguments for the divine authority of the Scriptures, and sees the force of them, and assents to them, he may reasonably conclude that the Holy Spirit has assisted him; but his belief, though thus assisted, is grounded upon evidence, upon inferences justly drawn from just premises; and faith must be founded upon reason, or it must be fanatical credulity. There is no medium.

9. He lived and died an example of all that he taught, of all active and suffering virtues.

10. He had no rival or antagonist, to make his authority appear doubtful, by opposing prophecies to his prophecies, and miracles to his miracles, from the time that he began his ministry to this day.

It cannot be supposed that there should be any deceit in this complicated evidence, and that falsehood should boast of all the imaginable characters of truth.

A LEARNED and ingenious person, but inclined to scepticism, said once to a friend, 'You often tell us how dangerous it is to reject the gospel, if it be true; but you consider not that there is the same danger in teaching it, if it be false. What can you say for yourselves when you come to appear before God, if you have misled the people in so important a point?'

His friend replied, 'We will suppose, if you please, that Christianity is not a divine revelation: let us consider the consequence.

'The consequence is, that deism is the only true religion; and these are its great articles: one God, the immortality of the soul, or its permanency so long as it shall please God, a future state of retribution, the eternal differences of moral good and evil, an obligation to love God and man, and to live righteously and soberly.

'All these points are forcibly inculcated by Christianity, and nothing is taught by us that invalidates them. If Christianity be not true, we have been deluded, and have thought too well of those who introduced revealed religion into the world; and that is all. The delusion hath led us into no iniquity, and authorized no crimes: it has been the most innoxious of all errors, an error pleading for every virtue, and dissuading from every vice.

'What danger can there be in such a religion, even upon any supposition? and how can it be imagined that the Father of mercies would not forgive such an error?

'If Christianity be true, the deist is in an error; and if his error be unavoidable, he is in the hands of a merciful God: but let him take heed that he deceive not himself;

for, if his unbelief arise from evil causes, 'God is not mocked.'

As far as the subsequent miracles mentioned by Christian writers fall short of the distinguishing characters belonging to the works of Christ and his apostles, so far they must fail of giving us the same full persuasion and satisfaction.

That they fall short in many instances, will appear to any one who shall examine them by the characters which we have enumerated above. I shall only observe:

1. They were not foretold by the prophets.
2. They were not wrought by prophets.
3. They contained in them no prophetic indications of future events.
4. No man ever laid down his life, or even suffered distress and persecution, in attestation of them.

Though this be an inquiry proper for those who have learning, leisure, and abilities, yet Christians at present are under no particular obligation to form any notion at all about the subject, any more than about many other things contained in the writings of the fathers, upon which Christianity cannot be said to depend. It were to be wished that the defenders of these miracles would remember that the dispute is not 'pro aris et focis,' and that the truth of Christianity is out of the question.

If we admit the miracles of Christ and of his apostles, we must not, when we examine the subsequent miracles, bring along with us a prejudice against them, from their own nature, and as they are acts surpassing human power.

Since they are not impossibilities, and imply no contradiction, they are to be examined like other facts; with this difference, that they require a stronger confirmation.

But there is in the heart of many persons a bent to an opinion concerning things preternatural, amounting nearly to this proposition: 'What we never saw cannot be true.' This bent hath seldom been more prevailing than in our age, and it is the business of reason to correct it, since it may mislead us as much as credulity.

In examining these later miracles, we must consider their

nature, the end for which they appear to have been performed, their tendency, the effects which they produced, and the credibility of the witnesses.

In this inquiry we shall find it scarcely possible to arrive at absolute certainty: of probability there is a variety of degrees; and a high degree of probability is sufficient to require and justify our assent, and differs little from certainty.

As the probability is more or less, such must be the credit which we give to it.

If the case be perplexed, we are not to form any judgment besides 'non liquet.' Doubt and suspense are then commendable, and God hath so ordered it, that many of our inquiries must end thus, to teach us at least modesty and humility.

The Christians of the second and third centuries, from Justin Martyr downwards, affirm that miracles were from time to time wrought amongst them: their consent in this seems to have been uniform and unanimous; which cannot be said for many of the miracles after Constantine, which, though received by the greater number, were suspected or rejected by some.

The general good character of these antient Christians, which yet is always to be understood with some exceptions; their low and afflicted state, their pious behaviour under it, their want of a divine support and encouragement to keep them constant to their profession, their remote situation from each other in various parts of the known world, their great numbers, and their success in converting multitudes; their open appeals to the Pagans in their Apologies, and the knowledge which the Pagans probably had of those appeals; the persons who attest these things, some of whom were confessors and martyrs, others learned, ingenious, and of a fair character, incline us to think that miracles did not entirely cease in those times, and that Christians could not combine together in carrying on impostures, or be able to impose them upon those whom they had converted, or be imposed upon themselves by dishonest brethren. It is strange that they should have been able to maintain so good a reputation as they did amongst the more moderate and unprejudiced Pagans, and have had the success amongst

them which they had, if they were so disposed to forging and to defending forged miracles.

According to the accounts which the writers of the second and third centuries have given us of these miracles, it appears not that they were performed in an absurd and superstitious way, but usually by plain and religious, and apostolical methods, as by prayer and invocation of Jesus; nor doth it appear that they were usually wrought for lucre, or to vest extraordinary authority in any person, or to augment the power of the clergy, or to decide religious controversies, or to run down any thing called heresy, and heterodoxy, or to establish any new doctrine, or to encourage and recommend voluntary and foolish austerities, a solitary life, vows of celibacy and virginity, worshipping of wood, rags, and bones, invocation of saints, &c. If a man, moved by these reasons, and by reverence to the antient Christians, should assent to the miracles attested by them, he ought not to be slighted, insulted, and ridiculed for it by those who have the same faith and hope, and acknowledge the same Lord and Master.

Such are the arguments in favour of the miracles of the second and third centuries; to which on the other hand is objected, the credulity of many of the Christians, the enthusiastic temper of others, the disingenuity of some of them in the matter of pious frauds; a disposition which Christians had in common with other people, to admit too easily any thing that favoured their own cause, and an unwillingness to oppose it; the forgeries of books, epistles, edicts, and reports, contrived by some of them, and received by others; the accounts of the miracles, which seem often founded upon hearsays and tradition, and many miracles notoriously and undeniably false, which are confidently reported by fathers and writers of the fourth and fifth centuries, who made no conscience of affirming the most childish absurdities in the marvellous way.

To these objections may be added, the force of imagination, and of a strong persuasion, which may have a strange and surprising effect in removing some bodily disorders, so that the cure shall be thought preternatural, both by the person who is relieved, and by those who have contributed to his recovery, and by those who are present; and

yet they may be all deceived, and all innocent of any design to impose upon mankind. Such seems to be the case mentioned by Minucius Felix concerning evil spirits, who being adjured, 'vel exsiliunt statim, vel evanescunt gradatim, prout fides patientis adjuvat, vel gratia curantis adspirat.' 27. for it is hardly to be supposed that miracles of this kind are wrought by halves, and by slow degrees.

It may be further observed, that the miracles mentioned by the apologists and antient fathers of the second and third centuries are usually healing the sick, and casting out evil spirits,—miracles in which there is room for some error and deception; we hear nothing of causing the blind to see, the lame to walk, the deaf to hear, the lepers to be cleansed.

Add to this, that notions of morality[d] have in some points varied in the Christian world, and been more or less strict in different times and places. The writing of books or epistles under borrowed names, and imposing them as genuine upon the public, is a thing of bad consequence, and an immorality; yet hath it been done by men who perhaps in other respects were honest. Writers of the fourth and fifth centuries have attested miracles which either they knew to be false, or did not know to be true; and yet many of them, in all probability, would have died rather than have renounced Christianity, and for no reward in the world would have borne false witness in a trial. There have been Christians who have readily fought duels upon slender occasions, and for a point of honour, and who would as readily have died for their religion.

Men will be inclined to determine this controverted question according to their preconceived notions, and their accustomed way of thinking; for there appears to be a

[d] 'De tout tems, je n'en excepte que les tems apostoliques, les evêques se sont crus autorisez à user de ces fraudes pieuses qui tendent au salut des hommes. Les ouvrages supposez en sont une preuve, et la facilité avec laquelle les peres ajoutoient foi à ces mauvais ouvrages, fait voir que s'ils n'étoient pas complices de la fraude, ils n'étoient pas scrupuleux à en profiter.' Beausobre Hist. de Manich. ii. 756.

sort of fatality in opinions of this kind, which when once taken up are seldom laid down. But, upon the whole, the arguments seem to preponderate a little on the side of the antient opinion, so as to incline us to suppose that miracles were sometimes wrought amongst the Christians, though at present it may be no easy matter to point them out distinctly.

Thus much may seem probable:—that in the second and third centuries, some sick persons were restored to health by the prayers of their brethren; that some virtuous Pagans had their doubts and prejudices removed, and were called to Christianity by divine impulses, dreams, or visions; and that the martyrs and confessors received an extraordinary assistance from God, enabling them to undergo horrible tortures and sufferings with amazing patience and constancy; which divine assistance, whether it may properly be called miraculous, it matters not much to inquire, for we will not dispute about words.

Whilst the church of Christ was subject to insults and persecution from the Pagan powers, and in a low and distressed condition, the Christians assembled together as often as they could, and took all possible care to instruct, and animate, and comfort, and relieve one another. When any of them were sick, the congregation prayed for them, and the presbyters visited them, and invoked the name of the Lord over them. Many of them recovered, and the recovery was accounted miraculous, and perhaps was oftentimes really and sometimes evidently so. It is impossible to show that it was unworthy of the divine power thus to exert itself for the consolation of the afflicted Christians, and for an evidence that God was with them of a truth. Great things are said in the Scriptures concerning the efficacy of prayer, to whose persuasive force may be applied what Pindar hath so elegantly feigned of music and poesy:

> Καὶ τὸν αἰχματὰν κεραυνὸν σβεννύεις
> Ἀενάου πυρός.

As the doctrines of divine influences upon the mind of man, and of the efficacy of prayer, are connected with the

doctrine of a particular providence, let us produce a few remarks on this subject, made by ingenious men who never passed for enthusiasts.

'Some thoughts and designs may be caused by the suggestion, and impulse, or other silent communications of some spiritual being; perhaps the Deity himself. For that such imperceptible influences and still whispers may be, none of us all can positively deny: that is, we cannot know certainly that there are no such things. On the contrary, I believe there are but few of them who have made observations upon themselves and their affairs, but must, when they reflect on life past, and the various adventures and events of it, find many instances in which their usual judgment and sense of things cannot but seem to themselves to have been overruled, they knew not by what, nor how, nor why, (i. e. they have done things which afterwards they wonder how they came to do;) and that these actions have had consequences very remarkable in their history. I speak not here of men dementated with wine, or inchanted with some temptation: the thing holds true of men even in their sober and more considering seasons.

'That there may be possibly such inspirations of new thoughts and counsels, may perhaps further appear from this; that we so frequently find thoughts arising in our heads, into which we are led by no discourse, nothing we read, no clue of reasoning; but they surprise and come upon us from we know not what quarter. If they proceeded from the mobility of spirits, straggling out of order, and fortuitous affections of the brain, or were of the nature of dreams, why are they not as wild, incoherent, and extravagant as they are? Not to add, that the world has generally acknowledged, and therefore seems to have experienced, some assistance and directions given to good men by the Deity; that men have been many times infatuated, and lost to themselves, &c. If any one should object, that if men are thus overruled in their actings, then they are deprived of their liberty, &c. the answer is, that though man is a free agent, he may not be free as to every thing. His freedom may be restrained, and he

only accountable for those acts in respect of which he is free.

'If this then be the case, as it seems to be, that men's minds are susceptive of such insinuations and impressions, as frequently by ways unknown do affect them, and give them an inclination towards this or that, how many things may be brought to pass by these means without fixing and refixing the laws of nature; any more than they are unfixt, when one man alters the opinion of another, by throwing a book, proper for his purpose, in his way? I say, how many things may be brought about thus, not only in regard of ourselves, but other people, who may be concerned in our actions, either immediately, or in time, through perhaps many intermediate events? For the prosperity or improsperity of a man, or his fate here, does not entirely depend upon his own prudence, or imprudence, but in a great measure upon his situation among the rest of mankind, and what they do. The natural effect of his management meeting with such things as are the natural effects of the actions of other men, and being blended with them, the result may be something not intended or foreseen.' Wollaston Rel. of Nat. sect. v. p. 106.

These things, according to the light of reason, are not improbable; and, as our author observes, no man can prove the contrary: but whilst we acknowledge the gracious influences of Providence in every thing that tends to make us better, and wiser, and happier, we must be very careful to keep the sober mean between the extremes, the one of excluding the divine interposition in the natural and moral world, the other of destroying human agency, or of ascribing the wild fancies of our own heads to the suggestions of the Holy Spirit.

Le Clerc, giving an account of 'An Essay on Divine Providence, by Robert Burrow,' says,

'Besides a general Providence, this author shows, *that there are extraordinary occasions, where God interposes in a particular manner*; as he did formerly by miracles, and by prophecies, and as he hath done since, by particular interpositions, which we cannot properly call miracles. It is very probable, not to say certain, that God can inter-

pose, and that he doth interpose now, as well as formerly, in extraordinary cases, though we perceive it not, because we are not forewarned that it shall be so. Things happen, which seem not to be according to the ordinary course of nature, but by a particular intervention of the Deity, though God doth not give us previous notice of it, as he did when he established the Mosaic and the Christian religion. God hath commanded us to call upon him, and hath promised to grant us whatsoever is proper for us. And who can doubt of his fulfilling these promises? Let us suppose that a good man, and a man whose welfare is very necessary to his family, which he has educated religiously, is in great danger of dying by a distemper, and that his family earnestly prays to God for his recovery. Is it not possible that they may, by their supplications, obtain from God the life and the health of this man, which else he would not have granted? Upon the supposition that his disease was mortal, and that without these prayers God would not have removed it, this would be a real miracle. In like manner, every thing that God gives to those who pray to him, and would not else give them, is a miracle, though we perceive it not, because we know not beforehand that it shall be so.

'In the number of these providential interpositions, supposing the fact to be true, might be placed what happened on the coasts of Holland and Zeland, the 14th of July, 1672. The United Provinces having ordered public prayers to God, when they feared that the French and English fleets would make a descent upon their coasts, it came to pass, that when these fleets waited only for the tide, to land their smaller vessels, it was retarded contrary to its usual course, for twelve hours; which disappointed the design, so that the enemies were obliged to defer it to another opportunity, which they never found, because of a storm that arose afterwards, and drove them from the coast.

'A thing of this nature, happening at such a juncture, to save the country from ruin, was accounted miraculous; and a prediction of it would have proved it to have been so. However, as nothing falls out without the concurrence of the Divine Providence, there was great reason to return thanks to God for the deliverance.

'In the history of other nations, events of this kind are recorded, which, if they had been foretold, must have been accounted real miracles.' Le Clerc Bibl. A. et M. xxvi. 391.

'Nec dubito quin etiamnum hodie Deus, precibus piorum permotus, multa occulte mutet in animis et corporibus, qua mutatione averruncet ab hominibus religiosis magnas calamitates, quæ iis alioqui contingerent. Multa operatur, quæ res nobis faciunt secundiores, et veritati, nobis insciis, prosunt; quamvis talia sub oculos non cadant. Sunt hæc vera miracula, sed Dei sese occultantis, etiam iis, in quorum gratiam hoc facit. Quare semper nos oportet ad Deum precibus confugere, et omnium eorum, quæ nobis secunda eveniunt, gratias ei agere; quamvis Deus sua illa occulta auxilia non venditet.' Clericus ad Isai. xlv. 15.

After Constantine, the miracles become extremely suspicious, both from their own frivolous or extravagant nature, or their apparent bad tendency, or many other circumstances, which I shall not here examine. I mean not by this that Providence never interposed in behalf of the Christian cause. The defeat of Julian's attempt to rebuild the temple may justly be ascribed to a particular Providence.

Monkery, and the immoderate veneration of saints and martyrs, and Christianity somewhat adulterated with Paganism, and the spirit of wrangling and of oppression, and religious controversies imprudently and indecently carried on by all parties, and false miracles, and feigned visions, came hand in hand, and prevailed too much.

There have been some, and there are many persons, who believing the truth of Christianity, doubt of the miracles after the apostolical age, or reject them. Such were Van Dale, and Moyle[d]; and Le Clerc, who yet was not so far

[d] Van Dale hath not declared himself fully of that opinion: but he rejected all the Pagan accounts of magicians, incantations, prophecies, oracles, miracles, &c. and he gave no credit to the ejections of dæmons after the age of the apostles and of the apostolical men, and to the stories which the fathers have related concerning dæmoniacs. He observes, that in the days of the apostles, the gift of casting out evil spirits, like other miraculous powers, was conferred upon a *few* persons, and to

fixed in that opinion, as to think it improbable that miracles were wrought in the beginning of the second century.

them only for great and special purposes; whence he concludes, against Tertullian and others, that in the subsequent ages *every Christian* could not have been endued with this power. According to his system, dæmons not being any longer permitted to take possession of human bodies, there was no occasion for exorcists. Every example of this kind, which might have been alleged, he would either have called in question, as not well attested, or would have ascribed to a divine power, and to good angels.

In Gerard Brant's History of the Reformation, it is related, that in the year 1566, the boys and girls who were educated in the charity-school at Amsterdam were possessed with evil spirits, and agitated and tormented to such a degree as to feel the ill effects of it all their lives after; and that during this disorder they spake new languages, and revealed the secret counsels and designs carried on against the protestants.

Upon which Van Dale thus delivers his opinion: 'Historiam hanc revera contigisse minime nego. Verum enimvero unde habent hi, prodentes alias et sinceri scriptores, hæc diaboli, in his pueris supernaturali modo operantis, opera atque effecta fuisse?—Nam si hic aliquid super- aut præternaturale statuendum, considerandum est minime pueros illos, diabolica quadam malignitate, in homines quosvis involasse, ipsosve pulsasse aut lacerasse, aliisve maniacorum furoribus incensos ulla mala perpetrasse, dum ipsi tam dira paterentur; sed ex adverso, *Mirabilia multa, de rebus præsentibus et plane occultis, manifestasse, ac quidem talia, quæ protestantibus*, qui tunc premebantur summis angustiis, *utilia possent esse ac salutaria*, contra persecutores, qui omni astu diabolico et crudelitate ipsos dispergere ac disperdere conabantur.—

'Pietati certe ac rectæ rationi, ipsique Sacræ Scripturæ, malorumque istorum temporum statui, longe magis convenit, talia nos providentiæ Divinæ majestatis attribuere, ut quæ in illis rerum angustiis, per talia, ut sibi caverent, piis ac probis reformatæ vitæ et doctrinæ hominibus auxilio esse voluit.' Dissert. de Idol.

Van Dale, a man not inclined to credulity, a scholar, and a physician, moved by the authority of wise and worthy persons and candid historians, was willing to admit the fact, and inclined to account it preternatural. He will not allow it to have been by the operation of evil dæmons; and yet, on the contrary, there are reasons, though he take no notice of them, to think that a good spirit would not afflict children in such a manner: and therefore some will be of opinion, that the case of these young persons was a bodily disorder, and a species of enthusiastic madness, exaggerated by the first relaters, and by common fame.

A reformation is seldom carried on without a heat and a vehemence which borders upon enthusiasm; and, as Cicero hath observed that there never was a great man 'sine afflatu divino,' so in times of religious contests there seldom was a man very zealous for liberty, civil and evangelical, and a declared and active enemy to insolent tyranny,

To these authors will it be permitted to add Middleton? He declared himself more than once in favour of revelation. Let us therefore err, if it be an error, on the side which is favourable to him and to his memory, and join him to these ingenious and learned men.

His system was treated by some persons as a novelty; but they should have said, *As far as we know*; for, be it right, or be it wrong, it certainly is not new.

'When the truth of our religion,' says Moyle, 'had been confirmed by so many signal miracles, which were never disowned by the Heathens themselves, it quickly triumphed over all opposition, and spread with a wonderful progress over all the parts of the Roman empire. When Christianity had gained such a footing in the world, the work was half done, and the rest might be safely trusted to the preaching of our ministers, and the suffering of our martyrs; and the ends of miracles being fully ac-

blind superstition, political godliness, bigotry, and pious frauds, who had not a fervency of zeal which led him, on some occasions, somewhat beyond the sober bounds of temperate reason. When men are thus disposed, and have animated each other, and are inflamed by opposition, persecution, and ill usage, they are strongly inclined to expect a divine interposition, and to explain every strange appearance that way. The impetuosity spreads far and wide, and seizes even upon children.

But as to the fact before us, I leave it, as I have some other points, undecided, to the judgment of the reader.

Many stories of this kind, but not so well attested, have been related concerning the protestants in Dauphiné and the Cevennes. It is said, amongst other strange things, that one of them, to prove himself a prophet, ordered a pile to be made and kindled, and stood unhurt for a quarter of an hour in the midst of the fire, whilst the flames surrounded him on all sides, and made an arch over his head; and that more than twelve hundred persons were present, and spectators of the miracle. See Le Theatre sacré des Cevennes, by Misson, which he wrote to defend the cause of the French prophets here in England. But these prophets were at last put, not out of countenance, (for such people never blush) but put to flight, when they had failed of their promise to raise a dead man, and had fallen out amongst themselves. Vid. Act. Erud. 1708. p. 137. et 1714. p. 69.

There will, in all probability, be a succession of such kind of persons in every age, and in one part or other of the Christian world, not exactly alike, nor yet very different.

'Facies non omnibus una,
Nec diversa tamen: qualem decet esse sororum.'

complished, it was high time for miracles themselves to cease; for God Almighty never wastes them in vain. This notion I take to be very agreeable to the general sense of the protestant divines, and for this reason I give little credit to any miracles since the days of the apostles. I am loth, I confess, to reject all, without reserve, for the sake of a very remarkable one, which happened at the rebuilding of the temple of Jerusalem, under Julian, which is so extraordinary in all its circumstances, and so fully attested, that I don't see with what forehead any man can question the truth of it, &c. Though the primitive Christians in general lived up to the full rules of their religion with the utmost probity and innocence of manners, yet it is too certain that there were some persons amongst them, who, through a mistaken zeal, made no scruple of lying for the honour of their religion. Their fictions found an easy reception in a credulous age, and were conveyed down to posterity as certain truths. I am not so uncharitable as to charge the faults and follies of particular men on the whole body of the Christian writers. On the contrary, I think them the persons chiefly imposed on, and that the far greater part of the fictions which appear in the authors of the three first centuries, were not wilful lies of their own invention, but mistakes, flowing from an easy credulity, and warm sallies of zeal that would not suffer them over-nicely to examine the authority of some facts which they thought would serve for the advancement of their cause.' Vol. ii. p. 100. 289.

Le Clerc was inclined to the same opinion, as appears from many passages in his writings. See Bibl. Anc. et Mod. xxvii. p. 175.

In his Bibl. Chois. xiii. p. 179. there are 'Remarks on Fontenelle,' &c. Le Clerc gave this as a foundling; but it looks very much like his own child, and in all probability it must be laid to him, as well as the 'Letters on Inspiration,' which, as he never owned, so he never denied. He there endeavours to prove that the ejecting of devils by the Christians after the apostolical age, and the wonders of that kind done by the sign of the cross, deserve no credit.

In his Ecclesiastical History, speaking of the miracles

related by Irenæus, he concludes, 'quibus quidem nemo fidem prorsus negare sustineat; sed tamen quæcumque boni viri, ab aliis audita et facile credita, iis temporibus quibus credulitas virtus habebatur, narrabant, vera propterea esse consequens non est. In honorem Dei salutemque hominum hyperbolica oratione uti nemo tunc temporis religioni ducebat.'

Le Clerc gives some account in his Bibliotheques, of the life and writings of Van Dale, and of the works of Moyle. Of the former he says, 'His conversation was lively and entertaining, and he delivered his sentiments without reserve. Sworn enemy to superstition and hypocrisy, he ridiculed them openly; which hurt him, as I have been told, on some occasions. He died physician to the poor, and to the hospital of Harlem, which office he exercised with great application and assiduity, though he was extremely attached to his studies.'

After speaking favourably of Moyle's works, particularly of his Dissertation against 'the Thundering Legion,' and recommending them to all lovers of truth, he adds, 'I have heard this learned and worthy man censured, as one who was inclined to free-thinking and unbelief: but in his writings I can discern nothing that tends that way; and therefore, till I see evident proofs of it, I shall always think that great injustice is done to the character of a person of his penetration and abilities.'

Le Clerc himself fared no better than Moyle, and 'Heretic' and 'Free-thinker' were *compliments* often paid to him, and to which he was accustomed; which made him the more disposed to defend his fellow-sufferers.

The Christian miracles may be referred to four periods.

The first period contains those which are recorded in the New Testament, and reaches to about A. D. 70. Of these there can be no doubt among Christians.

The next period may be of thirty-seven years, and ends about A. D. 107. There is reason to think it probable that some miracles were then performed by those who preached and planted the gospel in Pagan countries.

The third reaches from thence to Constantine. For some of the miracles in these ages, in the second and third

centuries, so much may be alleged as should restrain us from determining too positively against them, and denying them all.

The last period is from Constantine to where you please, and abounds with miracles, the defence of which shall be left to those who are inclined to undertake it, at the hazard of misapplying their pains. One sort of miracle seems to have been much wanted, and that was to cast the *Romantic Devil* out of the Christians of those times; but *this kind goeth not out* so easily, and stands in awe of no exorcisms.

Some few miracles, indeed, are said to have been wrought in the days of Constantine, and in remote regions, where the gospel was then first propagated, which, though for certain reasons one cannot rely upon them, yet may require a suspense of judgment.

If it be asked, when miraculous powers ceased in the church, the proper answer seems to be, that these miracles cease to us, when we cease to find satisfactory evidence for them.

Some of the post apostolical miracles shall be considered in the course of this work, and what may be fairly urged in their favour shall not be omitted: but it may not be amiss to declare, once for all, that I would not engage for the truth of any of them, after A. D. 107, and that I desire to be ranked, as to this point, not amongst the Denyers and Rejectors, but amongst the Doubters.

Eusebius, i. 13. relates that Abgarus, prince of Edessa, in Mesopotamia, wrote to Christ, and received a letter from him, and that Thaddæus was sent to Edessa, who cured this prince, wrought other miracles, and converted his people. Eusebius translated this account, or got it translated, from the archives of Edessa. There is no room to suspect him of forging it, but there is abundant reason to account it a forgery, and a foolish one too. Many, indeed, have received and defended it, from Ephraim Syrus down to Cave, and to writers of yesterday: but if they were twice or ten times as many, their united labours can never efface its indelible characters of puerility and improbability. See Le Clerc, Hist. Eccl. p. 332.

However, though this be a mere fable, and though Eusebius was to blame for not testifying a dislike or a doubt of it, yet there are some things implied in it concerning Edessa which cannot fairly be denied; as, that the gospel was preached there long before the time of Eusebius, and that it was preached when Christianity was in a low and afflicted condition, when neither worldly hope, nor fear, nor the vanity of imitating great nations, nor any motive of that kind could induce this people to receive it. It will therefore be no easy matter to account for their conversion, unless by supposing that the preaching and the miracles of some Christians prevailed with them to leave their own religion, delivered to them by their ancestors.

This happened in all probability in early times; and those 'dwellers in Mesopotamia,' who were in Jerusalem at Pentecost, and heard the apostles speak with tongues, might assist in planting the gospel at Edessa, or in preparing the way for it.

It is an antient and not an improbable tradition, that the Æthiopian eunuch preached and spread the gospel in his own country.

'Ipse eunuchus credens,—missus est in regiones Æthiopiæ, prædicaturus hoc quod ipse crediderat.' Irenæus, iii. 12.

'Philippus docuit Æthiopem et baptizavit, atque in Æthiopiam usque Christi præconem misit.' Cyrillus Hieros. Catech. xvii. p. 204.

'Eunuchus — apostolus genti Æthiopum missus est.' Hieronymus in Esai. c. 53.

Eusebius iii. 37. speaking of the successors of the apostles, at the latter end of the first and the beginning of the second century, says that several at that time went into various and remote countries, converting multitudes, and working many miracles.

The words of Eusebius intimate that he thought those extraordinary powers to be, at least, not very common afterwards. 'They went about,' says he, 'with God's co-operating grace, for *even then* the divine Spirit performed many miracles by them.'—σὺν τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτι.

καὶ συνεργίαι· ἐπεὶ καὶ τοῦ θείου Πνεύματος ἔτι τότε δι' αὐτῶν πλεῖσται παράδοξοι δυνάμεις ἐνήργουν.

It were to be supposed, though Eusebius had not said it, that these evangelists and apostolical men, and founders of uncorrupted Christianity in various places, had the power of working miracles, to introduce themselves to strangers, and to conciliate their regard and respect; and indeed without such credentials it is difficult to be conceived how disciples of the apostles could have succeeded in their attempts. It would have been very natural for the Pagans, when they had heard their story, to have said to them; If Christ and his apostles, not long ago, wrought such wonders as you relate, to convert men, we have reason to expect some from you; for you tell us that some of these powers were communicated to the disciples of the apostles. How comes it to pass, then, that *you* are without them? and if you have them not, why do you address yourselves to us?

What could they do amongst strangers, without miracles, without force, without singular dexterity and subtilty, without the aid of arts and sciences? Will you suppose the people to whom they went to have been colts and wild asses? and yet, if they were, stupidity and stubbornness often go together.

We read in the Acts of the Apostles, that many of the persons converted by the apostles, on receiving Christianity, received 'extraordinary gifts;' whence it is reasonable to think that they were also enabled, when they went about preaching the gospel, to confirm it by signs and wonders at some times, and on some occasions; else they would have done better in staying at home, lest they should discredit their cause, by having no power of this kind when they wanted it most.

Le Clerc would have been of the same opinion, if he had considered this point more particularly; for he says, 'The Christian church not only supported itself, but increased considerably during the second century, by means of the miracles which the last disciples of the apostles still wrought,' &c. Bibl. A. et M. vi. p. 336.

The Pagans indeed, at that juncture, wanted the testimony of miracles more than the Jews, for this reason; that

the Jews had the predictions of their own prophets, and saw, or might see, the completion of many of them in the person of Christ: but the Pagans would be less affected by that argument, till they were better acquainted with the history of the Jews and of their sacred books. He who in those early times preached to the Jews, might also appeal to the miracles of Christ and of the apostles, which they or their fathers had seen; but the remoter Gentiles were strangers to these things, and a few sensible proofs of the extraordinary powers of the Holy Spirit would to them have been more satisfactory.

We have not any pretence to reject the testimony of Eusebius as to the fact, that the gospel was preached by disciples of the apostles; and we have this to confirm it, that according to all antient history, Christianity, after the death of the apostles, continued to increase and to get ground in various regions.

This brings the probability of miracles down to the beginning of the second century, in the middle of which Justin Martyr says, There are prophetic gifts amongst us *even until now*, παρα᾽ γὰρ ἡμῖν καὶ μέχρι νῦν προφητικὰ χαρίσματα ἐστιν· and amongst these gifts he reckons up miraculous powers, as healing the sick, casting out evil spirits, &c. p. 315. 330. His words imply an opinion that such gifts were not only exercised in his time, but had been *continued down* to his time; and he may be justly supposed to speak the sense of his contemporary Christians: and that is all that I cite him for.

It seems probable, that if we had a full and authentic history of the propagation of the gospel, from the time of the apostles to the middle of the second century, composed by eye-witnesses and by the preachers of Christianity, we should find miracles wrought for the conversion of the Pagans. But from A. D. 70 to 150 is a dark interval, and we have very short accounts of the transactions of those days, unless we should accept of groundless rumours and frivolous tales.

ST. JOHN was banished by Domitian, A. D. 94. Tertullian, and others upon his credit, say that he was put into a vessel of boiling oil; which story Jerom repeats with a

few embellishments of his own. See Le Clerc, Hist. Eccl. p. 508. The apostle came out *unhurt*, says Tertullian. He came out *stronger and healthier* than he went in, says Jerom, who perhaps had in his thoughts Æson coming out of Medea's kettle;

> ' barba comæque,
> Canitie posita, nigrum rapuere colorem.
> Pulsa fugit macies: abeunt pallorque situsque,
> Adjectoque cavæ supplentur sanguine venæ;
> Membraque luxuriant. Æson miratur, et olim
> Ante quaterdenos hunc se reminiscitur annos.
> Ovid. Met. vii. 288.

Eusebius not only mentions not this tradition in his Eccl. History, or in his Chronicon, but in his Demonstratio Evangelica, speaking of the sufferings of the apostles, of the death of Stephen, of James the brother of John, of James the brother of Christ, of Peter, and of Paul, he only says of John, Ἰωάννης τε νήσῳ παραδίδοται, ' and John is banished and sent into an island.' iii. p. 116.

Christ had said to James and John, ' Ye shall drink indeed of my cup, and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with;' which possibly gave occasion to the invention of this punishment. The caldron (as a kind of scyphus Herculeus) represented the cup, and the oil the baptism, especially as oil was used in baptism in the days of Tertullian.

The anointing of the baptized person began about his time: it was not practised when Justin Martyr wrote, as appears from the account which he hath given of this religious rite; and the story of St. John's caldron might be made in Tertullian's days, to represent a figurative or metaphorical cup, and baptism, or afflictions and martyrdom.

Joannes Ciampini published an explication of an antient marble monument, which he thinks to have been of the sixth century. It represents, in basso relievo, a huge caldron or vessel, in which are a king and a queen; and a man standing by it pours water upon the head of the king, who is praying, with his hands joined. This he supposes to describe the baptism of some prince, performed by

immersion and superinfusion. See Act. Erudit. 1698. p. 46.

Tertullian had no small share of credulity; he proves that the soul is *corporeal*, from the visions of an *illuminated sister*, who told him that she had seen a soul. De Anima, p. 311. He affirms roundly, 'constat,' says he, 'Ethnicis quoque testibus;' that a fine city was seen for forty days, suspended in the air over Jerusalem. This report of some crazy pilgrim, or idle stroller, he adopted, as a proof that the millennium was at hand. Contra Marc. iii. 24. How can one depend upon his testimony in things which are of the preternatural and miraculous kind?

St. John is called a martyr by some antient Christians; and so he was, when he was banished to an island, and suffered 'pœnam capitalem.'

A. D. 107. CONTEMPORARY with Ignatius was Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, the father of traditions, and a man of small judgment, who wrote an exposition of the discourses of Christ. He was extremely diligent in inquiring 'what the antients, what Andrew, Peter, Philip, Thomas, James, John, Matthew, and the rest of the Lord's disciples had said or taught.' Apud Euseb. iii. 39.

Mr. Whiston has somewhere observed, that Papias takes no notice of Paul, and therefore probably was of the sect of the Ebionites, who hated that apostle. His remark is, like many other of his remarks, ingenious; and Papias is said to have made use of the gospel according to the Hebrews, which was received by the Ebionites. Euseb. But yet, in behalf of poor Papias, whom one would rather rank amongst the Simpletons than amongst the Heretics, it might be urged, that, as his design was to collect all the unwritten sayings and actions of Christ, he thought that nothing of that kind could be learned from St. Paul, who had not conversed with the Lord, as Peter, Matthew, &c. And indeed it is scarcely conceivable how Papias could reverence St. John, and yet be an Ebionite, since the gospel of that apostle is so directly against the notions of the Ebionites.

A. D. 116. We have an epistle of Tiberianus, governor of part of Palæstine, and called 'Palæstinæ primæ Præses,' to Trajan, in which he speaks of the invincible obstinacy of the Galilæans, or Christians, under his jurisdiction, with punishing and destroying whom he declares himself quite tired. Pearson, in his Vindic. Ignat. and some late writers, and Dr. Middleton also, treat this epistle as genuine; which is an oversight, since there are so many reasons to think it spurious, as Dodwell has showed, Dissert. Cypr. xi. p. 244. We have it only from Suidas and Malela, two sorry vouchers, and Eusebius knew nothing of it. See Middleton, Inquiry, p. 201. S. Basnage, Annal. ii. p. 38. and particularly Tillemont, who fairly gives it up, and informs us that Valesius accounted it the work of a *blockhead* and an *impostor*. Eccl. Hist. ii. p. 170. 571. Le Clerc also, though he lets it pass uncensured in his Apostolical Fathers, ii. p. 181. rejects it where he gives an account of that edition: 'Il y a—une relation *supposée* de Tiberien, gouverneur de la premiere Palestine, à Trajan.' Bibl. A. et M. xxi. 304. So I hope we shall hear no more of it henceforward, either for or against the behaviour of the martyrs.

Quadratus and Aristides wrote Apologies for the Christian religion, and addressed and delivered them to Adrian, A. D. 126. So Eusebius and Jerom inform us. See Tillemont H. E. ii. p. 232.

— τούτῳ Κοδράτος λόγον προσφωνήσας ἀναδίδωσιν, ἀπολογίαν συντάξας.—καὶ Ἀριστείδης—ἀπολογίαν ἐπιφωνήσας Ἀδριανῷ, καταλέλοιπε. Euseb. iv. 3. 'Quadratus—nonne Adriano Eleusinæ sacra invisenti librum pro nostra religione tradidit, et tantæ admirationi omnibus fuit, ut persecutionem gravissimam illius excellens sedaret ingenium?' Hieron. Ep. 84. Προσφωνεῖν is 'to dedicate' a book, which may indeed be done without presenting it. Τοσαῦτα βιβλία γράψας, οὐδενὶ τῶν βασιλέων προσεφώνησε, says Diogenes Laertius of Chrysippus. 'Some of the Pagan philosophers dedicated some of their books to Origen,' says Eusebius, vi. 19.—τοτὲ μὲν αὐτῷ προσφωνούντων τοὺς ἑαυτῶν λόγους,—see also Euseb. vii. 20.

Unfortunately, these Apologies are lost. If they could

be retrieved, even at the expense of some homilies and creeds, and controversial writings of the fourth and fifth centuries, it would be a cheap bargain.

It is not to be imagined that all the works of this kind, which were addressed to the emperors, were presented by the authors, or that books in those days were as much spread and as well known as they are now, since the art of printing; and yet the genteel civility and decency and politeness so observable in the Apology of Athenagoras[a], and in that of Melito, (of which a fragment is preserved in Eusebius) seem to imply that they had a design to offer them, or that they expected to have them perused by the emperor. See Fabricius, Bibl. Gr. v. 36. and Bayle's Dict. *Athenagoras.*

'Præsentem sane Cæsaribus fuisse Athenagoram, verba deprecantis ostendunt: Ὑμεῖς δὲ, ὦ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι φύσει καὶ παιδείᾳ χρηστοὶ καὶ μέτριοι καὶ φιλάνθρωποι, καὶ τῆς βασιλείας ἄξιοι, διαλελυμένων μὲν τὰ ἐγκλήματα—τὴν βασιλικὴν κεφαλὴν ἐπινεύσατε. 'Vos vero, o undequaque in omnibus naturâ simul et disciplinâ boni, moderati, benigni, et imperio digni principes, mihi, obsecro, qui crimina nobis objecta dissolvi, capitibus regiis annuite.' S. Basnage, Annal. ii. p. 161. A weak argument to prove that Athenagoras *pronounced* his Apology before the emperor! If Basnage had thought twice upon it, he would have blotted it out.

But it is not at all improbable that Quadratus and Aristides delivered their Apologies into Adrian's hand, or at least that those apologies were seen by him; for besides the testimonies of Eusebius and Jerom, which favour that opinion, it is to be observed that Adrian is represented in history as one whose knowledge was various and extensive, and who was excessively curious and inquisitive, 'curiositatum omnium explorator,' Tertullian Apol. He had studied all magical arts, he had been initiated into Pagan mysteries, and he must have been inclined to know the true nature of Christianity, and to see what the learned of that sect had to say for themselves. Julian, in his Cæsars, banters Adrian for his pragmatical disposition, little thinking

[a] Tertullian, compared to these two Fathers, in point of address and courtesy, is a very clown; and so is Justin Martyr.

that he was drawing his own picture, and not considering that he was just such another as Adrian in many respects.

There was then no edict or law which particularly forbad Christians to write in their own defence, or to read this or that book. Justin Martyr was probably mistaken in some of his assertions on this point, as Le Clerc observes, Hist. Eccl. p. 624. The last editor of Justin takes this point under consideration; but he hath hardly given a satisfactory account of it, or removed the difficulties. Præf. p. lxxxiv.

If there had been any danger in presenting an Apology to Adrian, yet every one who knows ecclesiastical history must know that the Christians of those times were men whom the fear of death would not have deterred. But the danger perhaps was not so great: Adrian seldom acted cruelly, except when he was moved by suspicion, jealousy, or envy; and whatsoever his temper was, he ever affected to appear generous, mild, open, gentle, and affable: 'in colloquiis etiam humillimorum civilissimus fuit,' says Spartian, Adr. 20.: much more might he admit Aristides, who was a learned man, an Athenian, and a philosopher; for he loved to converse with men of letters, and he was, by incorporation, an Athenian; he had been at Athens before he was emperor, and the Athenians had paid him the compliment of making him their *archon*, and he was always kind to them [b].

Adrian seems to have had no hatred for the Christians, or for any other religious sects, and to have been more disposed to banter than to persecute them. In a letter to Servianus, in which he gives the Ægyptians a very bad character, he observes that Alexandria was inhabited by Jews, Samaritans, Christians, and worshippers of the Ægyptian deities; and that all these people, notwithstanding their diversity of opinions, and their religious squabbles, in reality worshipped only *one* God, and that God was *Money*. See Vopiscus, Saturnin. 8. p. 719. and the Miscell. Observ. ii. p. 309. The Ægyptians had no extraordinary character with many people. Vid. Schol. Aristoph. Nub. 1128.

[b] Tillemont, Hist. des Emp. ii. p. 197.

Adrian gave a Rescript to Minucius Fundanus concerning the Christians (preserved in Eusebius iv. 9. and at the end of Justin's first Apology) which is obscure. It is probable that he composed it so on purpose, for the same reason that moved his predecessor Trajan to grant the Christians only a half favour, and a sort of connivance. Thus Severus Alexander paid divine honours to Christ, and was very kind to the Christians; and yet, as Lampridius expresses it pretty accurately, 'Judæis privilegia reservavit; Christianos esse passus est.' 22. 29. Adrian's Rescript, though it doth not manifestly exempt Christians from punishment, yet seems in some degree to favour them, and might have been so interpreted by a judge who was disposed to put the mildest construction upon it. The Christians therefore made their use of it, and often appealed to it.

Lampridius, who was a Pagan, mentions a report that Adrian had a design to deify Jesus Christ, and to build him a temple; but he positively affirms that Severus Alexander intended it. He adds, that the emperor (I suppose he means Alexander) was deterred by some persons, probably Pagan priests, who, consulting the gods, found, as they said, that, if such a thing were executed, Christianity would be established, and Paganism abolished. 'Christo templum facere voluit [Severus Alexander] eumque inter deos recipere. Quod et Adrianus cogitasse fertur, qui templa in omnibus civitatibus sine simulacris[c], jusserat fieri: quæ hodie idcirco quia non habent numina, dicuntur Adrianæ quæ ille ad hoc parasse dicebatur. Sed prohibitus est ab iis qui consulentes sacra, repererant omnes Christianos futuros si id optato evenisset, et templa reliqua deserenda.' 43. The report concerning Adrian's design was groundless, in all probability. See Spartian. Adr. 13. and

[c] Interea ea traditio Lampridii nobis lucro est. Etenim si imaginibus referta tum temporis fuissent templa Christianorum, fingi nullo potuisset modo, Adriania numinibus vacua Christo fuisse posita. Neque Adriano aliquid caussæ fuisset, cur ejusmodi templa conderet, expertia simulacrorum, si ecclesia in more habuit imagines in templis collocare. Nullæ quoque Constantino imperante imagines Christianorum in Basilicis videbantur, utpote quæ ad similitudinem Adrianiorum accedebant. Basnage, Annal. ij. p. 60.

Basnage, Annal. ii. p. 59.; and yet it evidently shows that he never passed for an enemy to Christianity.

Since the Christian Apologists[d] reproach the Pagans for their human sacrifices, Quadratus and Aristides may be supposed to have touched upon that subject. Adrian forbad this wicked practice, and also made laws in favour of slaves[e].

Several Apologies were afterwards made by Christians, addressed sometimes to the emperors and the senate. Pagans of rank and quality were perhaps not much moved by them: yet they must have had some knowledge of them; for doubtless the Christians, who valued neither danger, nor money, nor labour, when the common cause required it, and of whom some were of good families and fortunes, got them transcribed, and handed them about to persons of eminence, and it could be no difficult thing to give them to those emperors who had learning and humanity. And indeed, which is very remarkable, the Apologies are addressed to such sort of emperors, to Adrian, Titus Antoninus, Marcus Aurelius, Lucius Verus, and perhaps to Commodus[f], who, bad as he was, yet showed kindness to the Christians. The emperors commonly were accessible enough, and did not use to hide themselves like eastern monarchs. Augustus, for example, suffered all persons to approach him; and when a poor man once offered him a petition in a timorous manner, with a hand half extended and half drawn back, the emperor jested with him, and told him that he looked as if he was giving a halfpenny to an elephant. 'Promiscuis salutationibus admittebat et plebem, tanta comitate adeuntium desideria excipiens, ut quendam joco corripuerit, quod sic sibi libellum porrigere dubitaret, quasi elephanto stipem.' Suet. Aug. 53. Nor was the style of the apologists such as could disgust the readers. They wrote in general as well, and with as much learn-

[d] Dr. Middleton, and many besides him, have observed, that of the Christian Apologists, the latter often copy the earlier; and a man who reads them must be blind not to see it, or perverse not to own it.

[e] Tillemont, Hist. des Emp. ii. 262, &c. See also Eusebius, Præp. Ev. iv. 16, 17.

[f] Tillemont, Hist. Eccl. ii. p. 631. and Justin M. ed. Paris 1742. Præf. p. cxii.

ing, elegance, vivacity, and good sense, as their Pagan contemporaries. These Christians were by no means obscure and contemptible persons; they had enjoyed a liberal education, they were learned, and some of them had been philosophers, and retained the habit of philosophers; and in those days a philosopher and a man of letters might have access to persons of the highest rank and quality. Le Clerc was far from thinking that the antient defenders of Christianity were quite despised by the Heathen, as some are willing to imagine. On the contrary, he supposes that their arguments against Paganism contributed greatly to its destruction. 'It is very necessary for those who would be well acquainted with ecclesiastical history, to read the authors who in the early ages composed Apologies for Christianity, and at the same time overset the religion of the Heathen. These were the first attacks which were made on Paganism, and which gave the very Pagans such a disgust for it, that almost the whole Roman empire declared for Christianity, as soon as it was safe to do so.' Bibl. Chois. xxvii. 426.

UNDER Adrian the Jews revolted, and were severely handled, and Jerusalem was again taken, and sacked, and burnt, and totally destroyed, according to several writers. 'The melancholy view of its ruinous condition caused an infinite number of people to embrace Christianity, as it set before their eyes the truth of Christ's predictions,' says Tillemont, Hist. des Emp. ii. 295. for which he refers us to Eusebius, Demonstr. Evang. p. 407. ed. Par. But this accurate author is here mistaken, I think, and makes Eusebius say more than can fairly be inferred from his words. See the passage, which is too long to be here inserted.

AT this time lived Aquila, who translated the Bible into Greek. He was converted from Paganism by the piety and miracles of the Christians, says Epiphanius De Mens. c. 14, 15. and afterwards apostatized, and went over to Judaism. But Epiphanius was made up of hastiness and credulity, and is never to be trusted where he speaks of a miracle. For example:

He relates that many fountains and rivers were annually turned into wine on the same day, and at the same hour, when Christ wrought his miracle at Cana in Galilee; that this wonder continued at Cibyra in Caria, where he himself had drunk out of the fountain, and at Gerasa in Arabia, and that many testified the same of the river Nile.

The Pagans had miracles of the same kind. 'In Andro insula, templo Liberi Patris, fontem Nonis Januariis semper vini sapore fluere Mucianus ter consul credit.' Plinius ii. 106. p. 121.

'Mucianus Andri, e fonte Liberi Patris, statis diebus septenis ejus Dei vinum fluere, si auferatur a conspectu templi, sapore in aquam transeunte.' Idem, xxxi. 13. p. 549.

Baronius was either so credulous, or so disingenuous, as to urge this miracle at Andros in confirmation of those which are attested by Epiphanius. It was an artifice of the priests of Bacchus, and served to delude silly Pagans, as S. Basnage observes, Ann. i. 217.

We may conjecture, from the relation of Epiphanius, that there were in his time, i. e. in the fourth century, pious knaves, who once a year conveyed wine into the fountain at Cibyra, and that the father drank a cup of this adulterated liquor, and was imposed upon by these jugglers. The trick might serve for other purposes besides those of a godly nature; it might draw company to the Wells of Cibyra once a year, and enrich the neighbourhood, and the proprietors of the holy water.

This is the civilest thing that we can say of Epiphanius, since he must have been either a dupe or a deceiver. Learned and judicious men, who have examined his writings, have been forced to conclude, that, with all his learning and piety, he was credulous, careless, censorious, and one who made no scruple of romancing and misrepresenting.

The miracle of the fountains is just as good as that recorded by Orosius, that the tracks of Pharaoh's chariot-wheels remained in the sand of the Red Sea, and that neither the winds nor the waves could efface them.

Here is another tradition of the same kind from Epiphanius. Jerom mentions a particularity of the fountain Siloam,

that it flows not regularly, but bursts out with great violence at different times. 'Siloam autem fontem esse ad radices montis Sion, qui non jugibus aquis, sed in certis horis diebusque ebulliat, et per terrarum concava et antra saxi durissimi cum magno impetu veniat, dubitare non possumus, nos præsertim qui in hac habitamus provincia.' In Esai. viii.

If we may believe Epiphanius, God produced this fountain at the prayer of Isaiah, a little before the death of that prophet, when he was just expiring, and wanted water to drink; and thence it was called *Siloam*, or *Sent*. He adds, that when the Jews were besieged, if they went to draw water there, it sprang up in great abundance; but if their enemies approached to it, it withdrew itself: in testimony of which, says he, the fountain still bursts out at intervals, and suddenly. De Vit. Proph. This fable also is transcribed by Baronius, as a thing to be credited; for which he is justly censured by S. Basnage, Ann. i. p. 334. whom the reader may consult.

But what Josephus affirms concerning this fountain at the time when Jerusalem was besieged by the Romans, and which is also taken notice of by Basnage, is extremely remarkable, and should be added to what has been said, vol. i. p. 203. concerning the wonders which happened at the destruction of Jerusalem, and which showed that God had forsaken the Jews: Τίτῳ μὲν γὰρ καὶ πηγαὶ πλουσιώτεραι ῥέουσιν, αἱ ξηρανθεῖσαι πρότερον ὑμῖν. πρὸ γὰρ τῆς αὐτῆ παρουσίας, τήν τε Σιλωὰμ ἐπιλιπεῖσαν ἴστε, καὶ τὰς ἔξω τῆ ἄστεος ἁπάσας, ὥστε πρὸς ἀμφορεῖς ὠνεῖσθαι τὸ ὕδωρ. τὸ δὲ νῦν ἕτω πληθύουσι τοῖς πολεμίοις ὑμῶν, ὡς μὴ μόνον αὐτοῖς καὶ κτήνεσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ κήποις διαρκεῖν. 'Even the fountains flow profusely for Titus, which refused their streams to you: for this you know, that before his coming, Siloam, and all the springs without the city, failed to such a degree, that water was bought by the pitcher; but now they are so profusely liberal to your enemies, as to supply not only them and their beasts, but the gardens also.' Bell. Jud. ed. Hav. v. 9.

In the time of Domitian, Trajan, and Adrian, lived Plutarch. In his numerous writings he never makes any

mention of the Christian religion,—perhaps not daring to speak well, and not caring to speak ill of it, says Tillemont. I rather think that he had never examined it, or concerned himself about it. Philosophy and history engrossed his thoughts and his time.

A LITTLE earlier flourished Quintilian, who hath made a slight mention of Judaism. 'Et est conditoribus urbium infame contra isse aliquam perniciosam cæteris gentem, qualis est primus Judaicæ superstitionis auctor.' iii. 7. p. 270. ed. Burm. Some have imagined that he meant Christ and the Christians; but it is plain to the last degree that he reflects upon Moses. He had probably in view the conquests which that people made under Moses and Joshua, and their war with Vespasian and the Romans.

POLYCARP suffered under Marcus Aurelius, about A. D. 169. of whose martyrdom we have an account in Eusebius, iv. 15. who took it from an epistle of the church of Smyrna, of which he inserted the greater part in his history. Usher found and published a copy of this epistle, and it is inserted in Le Clerc's Patres Apostolici. In the conclusion there is a foolish note of one Pionius, the transcriber. There are some differences (though most of them small) between Eusebius and the Epistle, as for example, in the *dream* or *vision* of Polycarp, in the doxology at the end of his prayer, and in the description of the martyr standing in the flames, ὡς ἄρτος ὀπτώμενος, 'as a loaf whilst it is baking,' which is not in Eusebius.

The wonders relating to his martyrdom are these:

He had a dream or vision, portending what should befall him. Much the same thing is said to have happened to Socrates. See vol. i. p. 48. Καὶ προσευχόμενος ἐν ὀπτασίᾳ γέγονε, πρὸ τριῶν ἡμερῶν τοῦ συλληφθῆναι αὐτόν· καὶ εἶδεν προσκεφάλαιον αὐτοῦ ὑπὸ πυρὸς κατακαιόμενον· καὶ στραφεὶς εἶπεν πρὸς τοὺς συνόντας αὐτῷ προφητικῶς· Δεῖ με ζῶντα κατακαυθῆναι. 'Et cum oraret, triduo ante quam comprehenderetur, visio ei oblata est; viditque cervical suum incendio conflagrare. Tum, conversus ad comites suos, prophetice dixit; Oportet me vivum comburi.'

A voice from heaven encouraged him. Τῷ δὲ Πολυκάρπῳ εἰσιόντι εἰς τὸ στάδιον, φωνὴ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἐγένετο· Ἴσχνε καὶ ἀνδρίζου, Πολύκαρπε. Καὶ τὸν μὲν εἰπόντα οὐδεὶς εἶδε, τὴν δὲ φωνὴν τῶν ἡμετέρων οἱ παρόντες ἤκουσαν. 'Porro Polycarpo intranti in stadium, vox e cælo facta est; Fortis esto, et viriliter age, Polycarpe. Et eum quidem, qui vocem emisit, vidit nemo, vocem qui e nostris præsentes erant audierunt.'

The fire would not burn him. Μεγάλης δὲ ἐκλαμψάσης φλογὸς, θαῦμα μέγα εἴδομεν, οἷς ἰδεῖν ἐδόθη· οἳ καὶ ἐτηρήθημεν, εἰς τὸ ἀναγγεῖλαι τοῖς λοιποῖς τὰ γενόμενα· τὸ γὰρ πῦρ καμάρας εἶδος ποιῆσαν, ὥσπερ οθόνη πλοίου ὑπὸ πνεύματος πληρουμένη, κύκλῳ περιετείχισε τὸ σῶμα τοῦ μάρτυρος· καὶ ἦν μέσον οὐχ ὡς σὰρξ καιομένη, ἀλλ' ὡς ἄρτος ὀπτώμενος, ἢ ὡς χρύσος καὶ ἄργυρος ἐν καμίνῳ πυρούμενος. 'Cum vero ingens flamma emicasset, grande miraculum vidimus, quibus spectare concessum fuit; qui et ideo reservati sumus, ut aliis quæ contigerunt annunciaremus. Ignis enim fornicis speciem præbens, tanquam navis velum a vento repletum atque sinuatum, undique circumdedit martyris corpus; quod quidem in medio positum, non ut caro assa videbatur, sed veluti panis coctus, vel sicut aurum et argentum in fornace candens.'

A sweet smell came out of the pile. Καὶ γὰρ εὐωδίας τοσαύτης ἀντελαβόμεθα, ὡς λιβανωτοῦ πνέοντος, ἢ ἄλλου τινὸς τῶν τιμίων ἀρωμάτων. 'Tantam quippe fragrantiam odorabamur, ac si thus aut aliud quoddam pretiosorum aromatum oluisset.'

A great quantity of blood came from him; which seems to be mentioned as something marvellous.

A dove at the same time came out of the wound. Πέρας οὖν ἰδόντες οἱ ἄνομοι οὐ δυνάμενον αὐτοῦ τὸ σῶμα ὑπὸ τοῦ πυρὸς δαπανηθῆναι, ἐκέλευσαν προσελθόντα αὐτῷ κομφέκτορα παραβῦσαι ξιφίδιον· καὶ τοῦτο ποιήσαντος ἐξῆλθε περιστερὰ καὶ πλῆθος αἵματος, ὥστε κατασβέσαι τὸ πῦρ, καὶ θαυμάσαι πάντα τὸν ὄχλον, εἰ τοσαύτη τις διαφορὰ μεταξὺ τῶν ἀπίστων καὶ τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν. 'Tandem igitur cernentes improbi corpus ipsius ab igne non posse consumi, jusserunt confectorem propius accedere, pugionemque capulo tenus abdere. Quod cum ille fecisset, egressa est columba, item tanta vis sanguinis, ut ignem extingueret, utque universa plebs miraretur tantum esse discrimen inter infideles ac electos.'

From the agreement between the Epistle and Eusebius in the main (the *dove* excepted) it appears that we have the Epistle now as Eusebius had it, or nearly so; and since Eusebius speaks of it as of an antient and well-known writing, ἐγγράφως ἔτι φερόμενον, if it were a forgery, it must have been composed long before his time. But, excepting the marvellous parts, the rest of the narration hath all the appearance of truth and of fact; the manner of apprehending the martyr, the speeches of the proconsul, the behaviour and prayer of Polycarp, the rage of the populace, and particularly of the Jews, the zeal of the Christians and their affection for their bishop, &c. all is consistent and probable, and many little incidents are mentioned which have not the air of fiction.

The Christians who accompanied Polycarp at his execution, highly reverenced and almost adored him: they attended with a full expectation, as we may suppose, of seeing some strange events; and the sight of their dear and honoured friend thus dying might raise in them a tumult of passions, and take away some of the sedateness which may be requisite in forming an accurate judgment.

Let us now consider the miraculous parts of the story.

I see no reason to doubt of Polycarp's vision, or to think it improbable that this apostolical father, and holy martyr, should have been forewarned of his sufferings, and prepared to expect them, and enabled to give his friends this proof that God was with him and assisted him. He himself interpreted the vision, signifying by what death he should glorify God. Without this intimation he could not have known that he should be condemned to the flames, because there were many other ways of destroying criminals; and of several martyrs who at that time had been executed, not one was burnt, but they were thrown to the beasts, as the Epistle informs us, after having endured, with amazing patience and courage, the worst tortures which malicious cruelty could contrive; and when Polycarp was condemned, the populace requested that he might be exposed to the lions; and because it could not be done, they then chose to have him burnt.

To this foreknowledge which he had received of his death, he seems to allude in his last prayer at the stake, in

which he blesses God for calling him to martyrdom, and prays that he may be received of him as an acceptable sacrifice, καθὼς προητοίμασας, καὶ ΠΡΟΕΦΑΝΕΡΩΣΑΣ, καὶ ἐπλήρωσας, ὁ ἀψευδὴς καὶ ἀληθινὸς Θεός'—'quemadmodum præparasti, et *præmonstrasti*, et adimplevisti, mendacii nescius ac verax Deus.'

For these reasons I cannot assent to the solution proposed by Middleton: 'The foresight of his death and the manner of it, in the time of a cruel persecution, when his person was particularly hunted from village to village, as the principal and destined sacrifice, may reasonably be considered as the effect of common prudence, without recurring to any thing miraculous.' Inquiry, p. 9.

Polycarp prophesied that he should be burnt alive: the event was, that the fire could not burn him, its natural power being preternaturally suspended, and that he died by the sword. This, as the author of 'The Two previous Questions' observes, is a difficulty. It will afford reason to doubt either of the prophecy, or of the miracle by which the power of the fire was restrained; and of the two, it were better to give up the latter than the former, if both cannot stand together.

Tillemont was aware of this difficulty, and therefore supposes that Polycarp was killed by the fire, before he was wounded. 'Les Payens luy firent donner un coup d'épée.—Il ne faut pas doubter neanmoins qu'il ne fut mort des auparavant, puisque Dieu luy avoit revelé qu'il devoit estre brulé.' H. Ec. ii. 341. But this solution is also attended with some difficulties: The Epistle intimates no such thing, but rather that he died, partly at least, by the sword; and, if he perished by the flames, naturalists must determine whether a man who dies in the fire, and then is run through, will bleed plentifully. One would not willingly have recourse to a miracle for the effusion of blood, because such a miracle could tend to no purpose.

Le Moyne says, 'Licet fuerit *Polycarpus* vulnere et telo confossus, tamen vivus arsit, et in pyra beatam suam animam efflavit.' Proleg. ad Var. Sacr.

S. Basnage, who admits the rest of the account, hesitates at this part of it, at the effusion of blood: 'Unum est quod nos non satis capere profitemur: *Confectorem pro-*

pius accedere, &c. Tantumne sanguinis senili ex corpore pene exangui, ætateque confecto manavit e vulnere, ut pyra ardens et magna satis, penitus extincta sit? Cætera vero mirâ dulcedine alliciunt animos.' Annal. ii. p. 138.

Some, to reconcile the vision [g] with the event, will perhaps say that the vision of the pillow consumed by fire, was sufficiently completed by Polycarp's dying at the stake, and by the burning of his body after he was dead; and that, if there were a small error, it was in Polycarp's interpretation. 'Prophetæ visorum suorum non semper fidi interpretes. Donum prophetias interpretandi prorsus erat distinctum a prophetiæ charismate,' says Fell on Cyprian.

As to the voice from heaven [h], there is nothing frivolous in such a miracle; it might be true: but yet it is a miracle which might be counterfeited, and one single Christian might have made the speech from a house-top, near the stadium, and have lain concealed there; and if he kept his counsel, all his brethren might have been deceived by him.

The human voice, if it be clear and strong, may be

[g] When a deacon called Sosius was performing divine service, his head appeared surrounded with flames, which portended his martyrdom. Surius Sept. 23. The writer might borrow this from Polycarp's vision, or from Virgil's:

'Ecce levis subito de vertice visus Iüli
Fundere lumen apex:'

or from the story of Servius Tullius in Livy, i. 39. 'cui caput arsisse ferunt multorum in conspectu.' This Sosius was a companion of that Januarius who works miracles to this day in Naples with wonderful perseverance.

[h] When Constantius, an Arian emperor, was carried in funeral pomp, his friends affirmed that a choir of angels attended the procession, singing and playing in the air; and Gregory Nazianzen thought fit to record this miracle. '*Ea subdit Nazianzenus, quibus fidem afferre nobis est difficillimum:* Cum corpus Tauro monte superato, ad paternam civitatem veheretur, vox quædam e summis locis a nonnullis audiebatur, velut psallentium et prosequentium; angelicorum, opinor, cœtuum, quod pietatis illi præmium erat, funebrisque remuneratio.' Orat. 4. '*Quæ figmenta ex Ariana officina prodiisse videntur.*' S. Basnage, Ann. ii. 863. Gregory Nazianzen had a favourable opinion of Constantius; but Lucifer Calaritanus, Hilary, and Athanasius, load him with reproaches, and call him *Tyrant, Antichrist,* &c. Thus you have fathers against fathers, and saints against saints.

heard at a great distance. The heralds in Homer had this accomplishment, and were βοὴν ἀγαθοὶ, and Darius Hystaspis had an Ægyptian in the army who was as good as a speaking-trumpet. Ἀνὴρ Αἰγύπτιος φωνέων μέγιστον ἀνθρώπων, who saved Darius and the army when they were in great danger, by the force of his lungs. Herodotus iv. p. 266.

If the voice had been accompanied with an unusual splendor in the air, or with an earthquake, or preceded by thunder and lightning in a clear sky, the wonder had been evident.

The author of the Epistle observes, that *the Christians* who attended Polycarp *heard this voice*, but says not a word of the Jews and Gentiles, and leaves us uncertain whether they heard it or not.

A sweet smell issued from the pile. This is surely a very suspicious miracle, and they who have defended the account of Polycarp's martyrdom are willing to pass it over as fast as they can. They are in the right, for in truth it casts some dishonour upon the whole narration. The fact, in all probability, was true: scented wood is common in hot countries, and the odour might proceed from the fuel, for the people ran about to the baths and other places to get wood; and a Christian might also join with them, and bring a bundle of wood with aromatics enclosed in it, to honour the funeral of his bishop. It had been an antient fashion in various places to waste abundance of aromatics in burning dead persons of rank and quality; or those who threw themselves alive into the flames, in complaisance to the deceased, or in compliance with cruel custom, as the Indian wives; or a philosopher, who now and then mounted the pile, and entertained the public with roast-meat, as the Gymnosophists, Calanus, &c. The writer of the Epistle would make us believe that these perfumes were conferred on Polycarp's pile, miraculously no doubt, else it would not have been worth the recording. The Christians, however frugal in other respects, yet in these expenses were very profuse at the interment of their brethren. 'Si Arabiæ queruntur,' says Tertullian, 'sciant Sabæi pluris et carioris suas merces Christianis sepeliendis profligari, quam Diis fumigandis.'

This account of the yielding of the flames, of the voice, and of the sweet odour, might give occasion to later writers to apply these wonders to other martyrs, as they frequently do. See Prudentius Περὶ Στεφ. vi. 100. and Basil, Hom. v. not to mention many more. The history of 'the aromatic scent of the sacred bones' would fill a moderate folio. By the help of this odour reliques were discovered, and genuine bones distinguished from counterfeits; and it was very easy to find out a saint, without borrowing the lanthorn of Diogenes:

'Ubi ubi est, diu celari non potest.'

Tillemont is excessively fond of this prodigy, and never fails to record it with great seriousness; and indeed there is no reason to question the fact, for of all miracles it is the easiest to be performed, and therefore the least satisfactory:

—'Non bene olet, qui bene semper olet.'

The Pagan goddesses also smelt very sweetly, as the poets, to whom they were best known, testify:

'Ambrosiæque comæ divinum vertice odorem
Spiravere,'

says Virgil.

'Mansit odor; posses scire fuisse deam.'

Ovid. Fast. v.

The temple at Hierapolis smelt of the sweetest perfume, as the writer De Dea Syria assures us.

In Abulfeda's life of Mohammed, we are told that a most agreeable odour proceeded from his carcase after he was dead.

Copres, a monk of the fourth century, is said to have stood half an hour in the midst of a great fire, unhurt, to confute a poor Manichæan doctor who could not perform the same exploit. Rufinus Vit. Patrum. Helles, another monk of those days, would carry fire in his bosom, which neither singed his clothes nor his skin. Sozomen vi. 28. This miracle was wrought with a view to what is said, Prov. vi. 27. 'Can a man take fire in his bosom, and his clothes

not be burnt?' But Solomon, as well as Bernard, 'non vidit omnia.' 'Can one go upon hot coals, and his feet not be burnt?' Prov. vi. 28. This is what Pagans have pretended to do, as we shall see:

'incedunt per ignes
Suppositos cineri doloso.'

The arching of the flames, &c. if it were just as the author of the Epistle relates it, must have been something preternatural: but the question is, whether the author's imagination did not impose upon him, and make him fancy a little more in it than there really was. If Polycarp had prophesied that his enemies could not and should not burn him, it had been remarkable indeed[i]: but here is a martyr, who could not be burned, and who was run through without difficulty. Besides the seeming disagreement of the prediction and the event, one may reasonably ask,—To what purpose this miracle? nor is the question easily answered.

Yet that is not all: the miracle was not only of the useless kind, but it might have produced rather a bad than a good effect on the minds of the spectators. The Pagans had many examples in their fabulous and poetic history of men who had been unhurt in the flames; and they had also their priests and priestesses who walked barefoot over the fire without harm: but these things were supposed by some Pagans to be tricks, by others to be magical operations; and consequently the inference made by the vulgar Pagans, and perhaps by the Jews, would have been, that Polycarp was an old magician, who had recourse, though in vain, to inchantments; and that his dæmon had secured him for a time from the flames, but could not protect him from the sword[k].

[i] Therefore, as later authors improve upon their predecessors, the writers of the martyrdom of Romanus say, that when he was condemned to the flames, he declared before hand that the fire should not burn him, and accordingly a miraculous shower (borrowed, it may be, from the story of Crœsus in Herodotus) put it out. Prudentius.

[k] It was the opinion of some that Crœsus had escaped the flames by the help of incantations.

Ἐφέσια γράμματα — ἐπῳδαὶ γὰρ, τινὲς φασὶν, ἐκεῖνα ἦσαν, ἃς καὶ

Virgil Æn. xi. 785.

'Summe Deûm, sancti custos Soractis Apollo,
Quem primi colimus, cui pineus ardor acervo
Pascitur; et medium freti pietate per ignem
Cultores multa premimus vestigia pruna.'

Where Servius: *Freti pietate.* Iste quidem hoc dixit; sed Varro, ubique expugnator religionis, ait, cum quoddam medicamentum describeret: *Eo uti solent Hirpini, qui ambulaturi per ignem, medicamento plantas tingunt.*

'Haud procul urbe Roma in Faliscorum agro familiæ sunt paucæ, quæ vocantur Hirpi: hæ sacrificio annuo, quod fit ad montem Soractem Apollini, super ambustam ligni struem ambulantes non aduruntur. Et ob id perpetuo senatusconsulto militiæ omniumque aliorum munerum vacationem habent.' Plinius l. vii. p. 372.

Ἐν τοῖς Κασταβάλοις ἐστὶ τὸ τῆς Περασίας Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερὸν, ὅπου φασὶ τὰς ἱερείας γυμνοῖς τοῖς ποσὶ δι' ἀνθράκων βαδίζειν ἀπαθεῖς. 'Apud Castabala autem Perasiæ Dianæ fanum est, ubi aiunt fœminas sacerdotes illæsis pedibus per prunas ambulare.' Strabo.

Le Clerc speaking of the water of jealousy, Numb. v. says, 'An ultio divina perjurium illico sequeretur non docet Moses, et rara hæc videntur fuisse exempla. Hugo Grotius exempla ex Scriptoribus Ethnicis adfert fontium, quorum aquæ perjuros arguisse feruntur, nec rei fidem detrahit. Sed tot ficta miracula apud Ethnicos narrabantur, ut ulli credere vix possimus. Alia est ratio Hebræorum, &c. Multa quoque in infimi ævi historiis habemus de

Κροῖσος ἐπὶ τῆς πυρᾶς εἰπὼν ὠφελήθη — Παυσανίας δέ φησιν, — ὅτι φωναὶ ἦσαν τὰ Ἐφέσια γράμματα φυσικὸν ἐμπεριέχουσαι νοῦν ἀλεξικακον, ἃς καὶ Κροῖσον ἐπὶ πυρᾶς, φησὶ καὶ αὐτὸς, εἰπεῖν. 'Ephesiæ literæ — dicunt enim illas fuisse incantationes quasdam, quas et Crœsus jam rogo impositus pronunciarit atque ita liberatus fuerit.— Pausanias vero ait—Ephesias literas fuisse voces quasdam, quæ naturalem quandam virtutem malorum depulsoriam haberent; quas, ut etiam ille testatur, Crœsus rogo impositus pronunciaverit.' Eustathius in Odyss. Suidas. Etymol. Magn.

Of the same kind with the Ephesian Letters were these charms;

'Sista, Pista, Kista, Xista.'

and

'Daries, Dardaries, Astaries, Dissunapiter, Huat, Hamat,' &c. to which Varro and Cato ascribe great powers.

probationibus per ignem, per aquam, &c. quæ tam mihi nefas videatur omnia credere, quam omnia rejicere. Certe ut veri non sunt sat clara in iis argumenta: ita nec mendacii indiciis manifestis notata sunt. Ideoque an vera sint, aut falsa, nos quidem scire non possumus.'

The custom of trying the innocence of suspected persons by fire, or boiling water, is very antient, for it is mentioned in the Antigone of Sophocles [k], and it lasted till the fourteenth century in Europe, and is said to continue still in some places. But the horrible rashness and the profane impudence of appealing thus to God, without his permission, and of calling upon him to interpose miraculously, and the injuries which on these occasions have been done to the innocent, and the favour which hath been showed to the guilty, incline us to think that no miracle of this kind was ever wrought at such trials, and that they who escaped used some tricks, as well as the Hirpi. It would not be difficult to paint iron bars so as to make them look as if they were red-hot.

But, to return to Polycarp's martyrdom: If we may be permitted to hazard a conjecture upon this occasion, we may suppose that the Jews and Pagans, full of rage, brought together wood enough to burn ten persons, and heaped it all round the martyr, and set fire to it in many places, which blazed up, as at the pile of Crœsus [l], *περὶ ἔσχατα*, at the extremities on all sides, and arched over Polycarp [m]. Upon this some of the Christians began to cry *A miracle*; his enemies said that the man was *a magician*, and fearing, perhaps, lest something extraordinary should appear in his favour, called for the executioner to dispatch

[k] Ἥμεν δ' ἕτοιμοι καὶ μύδρους αἴρειν χεροῖν,
Καὶ πῦρ διέρπειν, καὶ θεοὺς ὁρκωμοτεῖν—

'Eranus quoque parati et ferrum ignitum levare manibus,
Et per ignem ire, et jurare Deos.' v. 270.

[l] See the story in Herodotus.

[m] Something not unlike this was seen at the martyrdom of Porphyrius,—*ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀφθείσης ἔξω ἀπὸ μακροῦ ἀποστήματος κύκλῳ περὶ αὐτὸν τῆς πυρᾶς, ἐνθένδε κἀκεῖθεν ἁφαρπάζοντα τῷ στόματι τὴν φλόγα.* 'Quin etiam cum rogus satis longo ab ipso intervallo circumquaque accensus fuisset, ipse hinc inde flammam ore attrahebat.' Euseb. Mart. Pal. 11.

him quickly. There was no withstanding the giddy impatience of an irritated populace. The executioner complied, and ran Polycarp through, when he was almost dead, and suffocated with the flames, and when perhaps his lower parts had been scorched; and thus he perished partly by fire, and partly by the sword.

In order to reconcile the whole account, and to remove useless prodigies, it seems reasonable to suppose that there was nothing miraculous in the arching of the flames, that the fire had almost killed the martyr when he was wounded, and that the blood which issued from him quenched or damped the fire only on one side, and where it burned weakest.

The writer of the Epistle observes, that Polycarp stood in the fire, ὡς χρυσὸς καὶ ἄργυρος ἐν καμίνῳ πυρούμενος, 'sicut aurum et argentum in fornace candens,' alluding possibly to those passages of Scripture where the righteous are compared to gold and silver tried in the furnace; or to what is said of Christ, Revel. i. καὶ οἱ πόδες αὐτοῦ ὅμοιοι χαλκολιβάνῳ, ὡς ἐν καμίνῳ πεπυρωμένοι. Eusebius uses the same kind of expression concerning Peter, who suffered martyrdom at the stake, in Diocletian's persecution:—διὰ πυρὸς οἷα χρυσὸς ἀκραιφνέστατος—'velut aurum purissimum per ignem probatus.' Mart. Pal. 10.

The story of the *dove* coming out of Polycarp's body, which is in the Epistle, but not in Eusebius, or Rufinus, or Nicephorus, or two MSS of the Latin translation of the Epistle, arose possibly from a corruption of the text. The executioner stabbed him, and then ἐξῆλθε περιστερὰ καὶ πλῆθος αἵματος, 'a dove came out, and abundance of blood.' It is not likely that the author would have related so marvellous a circumstance so concisely and coldly, in one single word περιστερὰ, just as if he were ashamed of it, and wanted to get over it as fast as he could: but he might have written, with a very small alteration, ἐξῆλθεν ἐπ' ἀριστερὰ πλῆθος αἵματος, ὥστε κατασβέσαι τὸ πῦρ, 'a great quantity of blood issued out on,' or 'to the left side, and put out the fire' (on that side:) after which, the commanding officer ordered his body to be laid upon the wood and consumed, and the Christians had leave to gather up his bones. Or we might read, with an alteration still

smaller, and without striking out the καὶ, ἐξῆλθεν ἐπ' ἀριστερὰ καὶ πλῆθος αἵματος, supposing καὶ to mean 'even:' 'there issued out even so much blood as to extinguish the fire.' The *dove* could scarcely be mentioned designedly by the author, who would have said something more, or nothing at all. The first conjecture is proposed by Le Moyne; but he writes it ἐξῆλθ' ἐπ' ἀριστερᾷ. I should prefer ἐξῆλθεν, to avoid poetic numbers; and besides, the accusative plural ἐπ' ἀριστερὰ, joined to a verb of motion, would be better than the dative or ablative singular, ἐπ' ἀριστερᾷ. Ἐξῆλθεν ἐπ' ἀριστερὰ 'exivit ad lævam,' as in Homer Il. M. 239.

Εἴτ' ἐπὶ δέξι' ἴωσι πρὸς ἠῶ τ' ἠέλιόν τε,
Εἴτ' ἐπ' ἀριστερὰ τοίγε, ποτὶ ζόφον ἠερόεντα.

Genes. xiii. 9. εἰς ἀριστερὰ — εἰς δεξιά. And so very often in the LXX,

Somebody[n] hath proposed, ἐξῆλθε περισσεία καὶ πλῆθος αἵματος, i. e. 'there came out plenty and abundance of blood;' which is clumsy enough. Another improves upon it, and conjectures, ἐξῆλθε περισσεία ὕδατος καὶ πλῆθος αἵματος, which is too bold, and passes the bounds of sober criticism.

When the virgin Eulalia was put to death, a dove, spotless and white as snow, flew out of her mouth, says Prudentius Περὶ Στεφ. iii. 161. This hath made some suspect that the story of Polycarp's dove might be somewhat more antient than the time of Prudentius, and give occasion to the fiction about Eulalia's dove.

In the third century, when the Roman Christians were assembled together to choose a bishop, a dove came and sat upon Fabian's head, to point him out for that office. This rumour Eusebius inserted in his History, vi. 29. but he might as well have left it out.

In the fourth century, Ephraim Syrus went to Cæsarea, to visit Basil, and to hear him preach, and saw a dove, white as snow, and bright as the sun, sitting upon Basil's

[n] Amongst other conjectures, one is, ἀπ' ἀριστερᾷ. It should have been ἀπ' ἀριστερᾶς, or ἀπ' ἀριστερῶν.

shoulder, and whispering to him what he should say. See Tillemont H. E. ix. 208.

These prodigies were borrowed partly from Pagan prodigies and auguries, and partly from some passages in the Gospels, to which Christians ought to have paid more reverence, and not to have made this imprudent and impertinent use of them.

It seems probable upon the whole (for in points of this kind there is no such thing as certainty) that the writer of the Epistle did not mention the dove. It is impossible to determine whether Eusebius found περιστερὰ in his copy or not; because, though he had seen it there, he might have dropped it on purpose, accounting it to be either a ridiculous miracle, or an interpolation. When he gives an account of the death of Herod Agrippa, from Josephus, αὐτοῖς γράμμασιν 'in the very words,' he drops the *owl*, who, as Josephus says, appeared over the head of Agrippa; in which omission there is perhaps a little too much of the finesse. Mr. Whiston endeavours to vindicate Eusebius in this affair, and forces the *owl* upon him by the help of a conjecture. We are certain that this *bird* is in Josephus, but we have little reason to conclude that he ever was in Eusebius. One owl in the hand is worth two in the conjectural bush. See Eusebius H. E. ii. 10. and Josephus Ant. xix. 8. and Mr. Whiston's Translation and Notes.

Eusebius i. 9. cites Josephus as mentioning 'Lysanias the Tetrarch,' for which Jos. Scaliger and Valesius blame him, and take it to be a wilful misrepresentation.

After all, supposing that Eusebius suppressed the dove, I see no reason for *tragical outcries*, that, by granting this, we must give him up as a writer of no integrity, and that all his credit is at an end. He had his defects, as well as other antient writers, and some of those faults shall be taken notice of in their proper place. But in the case before us it may be said, he had no mind to expose Christianity to the scoffs of infidels, and himself at the same time, by recording such a silly contemptible tale; and in such cases suppressions are more allowable than interpolations; the latter are always unpardonable, the former may sometimes be excuseable; for, as a critic, Eusebius might justly suspect that the passage was not genuine, and, as an histo-

rian, he might not care to go out of his way, and give reasons for omitting it, since that was not the method of writing in antient times.

'Le Clerc,' says Middleton, 'took περιστερὰ to be the true reading.' How doth this appear? 'Because he gave it in his edition of the Apostolical Fathers.' And so would any fair editor; who ought to represent the reading of the manuscript in such a remarkable place. 'But Le Clerc says nothing against it in his notes.' True: because he was in haste, which was often the case with him, and not disposed to discuss the question. In his Ecclesiastical History he passes the *dove* over in silence, as not worthy to be mentioned, p. 729. and in his Bibl. Chois. xxvi. p. 218. he absolutely rejects it as an interpolation. 'Il n'y a rien de cette colombe dans un MS. que le P. Ruinart cite, non plus que dans Eusebe, &c. ce qui fait croire que c'est une addition de quelcun, qui vouloit rendre, par une fraude pieuse, le martyre de S. Polycarpe plus merveilleux.'

Polycarp's prayer at the stake is such as one might expect from a holy martyr, and it is in few words. When he had finished it, and said 'Amen,' they set fire to the pile. Ἀναπέμψαντος αὐτοῦ τὸ ἀμήν. 'Cum Amen clara voce insonuisset——'.

'Verbum ἀναπέμψαντος hoc mihi indicare videtur, ipsam quidem orationem tacite ac submissa voce a Polycarpo pronunciatam fuisse; Amen vero edita voce prolatum.' Valesius.

'Non potuissent preces ab iis qui aderant Christianis audiri et aliis referri, si submissa voce eas fudisset Polycarpus. Quod miror Valesium ad animum non revocasse.' Clericus Hist. Eccl. p. 728.

The observation of Valesius is indeed neither judicious, nor worthy of him; nor will the word ἀναπέμπειν, joined to *Amen* (take it as you will), prove that *the prayer* was uttered in a *low voice*. It should have been translated simply, 'Et postquam Amen pronunciasset,' or 'emisisset—'

When the proconsul exhorted Polycarp to comply, and to repent, and to say, Αἶρε τοὺς ἀθέους, 'Away with the impious,' the saint, looking severely on the multitude, and sighing, said, 'Away with the impious.'

This, in the sense in which Polycarp must be supposed

to have meant it, hath been thought too uncharitable, and therefore a forgery of the writer: yet, candidly interpreted, it may mean no more than this, 'May true religion flourish, and impiety cease! and some perhaps will be of opinion that this apostolical father spake *prophetically* to the wicked and persecuting Jews and Gentiles of Smyrna, who stood round him, impatient to destroy him: for not long after his martyrdom the city of Smyrna was overturned by a very violent earthquake, A. D. 177. in which many of them may be supposed to have perished. Dio l. lxxi. Aristides Orat. 20, 21, 22. 41.

When Polycarp was urged by the proconsul to renounce Christ, he replied, 'These eighty-six years do I serve him,' &c.

Hence some have concluded that he was just so many years old. S. Basnage is of another opinion, and says that Polycarp meant, he had been so many years a bishop. Irenæus also represents him as 'extremely and uncommonly old,' ἐπιπολὺ γὰρ παρέμεινε· καὶ πάνυ γεραίλεος.—Hence Basnage concludes that he was about one hundred and twenty years old when he died. Annal. i. p. 792. I think we may suppose that the eighty-six years mentioned by Polycarp were neither those of his life, nor those of his episcopal function, but of his being a Christian; and then, if he was converted at fourteen, he would be a hundred years old at his death. Many other persons have arrived at that age; and amongst Gruter's inscriptions is this: 'MEMORIAE SEX. VIGELLII. AQVINAT. QVI ANNVM ATTIGIT CENTES. SED ALTERVM ET NONAG. PERPET. INOFFENSA VALETVD. EXEGIT.'

Polycarp says to the Philippians (in the old Latin version of his epistle, which supplies the defect of the Greek copy), 'De vobis enim gloriatur [Paulus] in omnibus ecclesiis, quæ Deum solæ tunc cognoverant: NOS autem nondum noveramus.' Basnage, who, with Usher, thinks that Polycarp means himself by NOS, makes this an argument for his great length of life: but it is not evident that Polycarp speaks of himself; he may mean the Christians of Smyrna, as Cotelerius observes.

Tillemont places his death A. D. 166. See Hist. Eccl. ii. p. 635, &c. S. Basnage dates it 169.

When they would have fastened him with nails to the stake, he desired them to desist. He for whom I suffer, said he, will enable me to stand still, and not to fly from the fire: nor did his resolution fail him.

The miracles at his martyrdom are of the dubious and suspicious kind; and it is *possible* that the epistle itself, which contains them, might have passed through the hands of interpolators before it came into those of Eusebius. That he suffered martyrdom is unquestionable: besides many other testimonies, we have that of Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, in the second century, who says, Πολύκαρπος ὁ ἐν Σμύρνῃ καὶ ἐπίσκοπος καὶ μάρτυς· apud Euseb. v. 24.

'If any[o] one imagine the relation made by the church of Smyrna, on this occasion, to be just and faithful, he has a right to believe it.' I think so too: and I add, that we have no right to insult him for being of that opinion. But let others also be permitted to suspend their assent.

Whatsoever we determine concerning the wonders, the behaviour of Polycarp and of his contemporaries and fellow-Christians teaches us to determine that God was with them and assisted them. The sufferings of the Christians afforded examples of courage and constancy which seemed more than human; and had an happy effect in converting others. We have authentic accounts of many persons, in the bloom of life, and of the infirmer sex, who received the sentence of condemnation to a cruel death[p] without consternation; and underwent it without a complaint, and sometimes with exultation and joy. When we read that Arria gave her husband the sword from her bleeding breast, with, 'My dear, it is nothing,' we admire the deed and the speech. In the Pagan lady such resolution is heroism: in the Christian what is it less?

The persecution which the Christians endured was the

[o] Two previous Questions, &c. p. 31.

[p] In Diocletian's persecution, the Pagans endeavoured to invent the most painful torments, to weary out the patience of the Christians, and to make them recant: and the pious Christians of later ages, who have presided over the Inquisition, have imitated the Pagans in all these cruelties, and used their best endeavours to surpass them in barbarity; and perhaps studied the Acts of the Martyrs, and the ecclesiastical historians for this purpose: though indeed Satan might inspire them without such helps.

completion of Christ's predictions: the fortitude with which they endured it was the completion of his promises. He bequeathed calamities and sufferings to them as a legacy; and he commanded them to die for his sake: a command hard to flesh and blood! But he promised that he would be with them, and make his abode in them; and be their strength and support when all things else should fail and forsake them.

Many were the motives which concurred to animate the antient Christians; motives which might sometimes produce an excess of courage bordering upon rashness and enthusiasm: but as the love[q] of life, and the abhorrence of pain, are universal passions, there seems wanted a cause as universal to overcome them in persons of all nations, ages, sexes, and conditions; and there is none which will operate uniformly, besides a divine[r] assistance; none to which we may more reasonably ascribe it, as to the leading and principal cause, since it suits so well with the predictions and the promises of Christ. Some will call the doctrine of divine assistance *fanaticism*; but let them remember, that many wise Pagans held it, for they will perhaps hearken to a Platonist or a Stoic. To suppose that God takes no care of good men in the violent trials and distresses which they undergo for his sake, is entertaining a mean opinion of Providence. This divine favour was not confined to the three first centuries: it hath been extended to multitudes, who since that time have fallen innocent victims to antichristian tyranny, and have laid down their lives for their religion with as much constancy as the antient Christians.

But it will be said, All Christian sects have had those whom they call martyrs; and shall we bestow that honourable appellation on the schismatical or the erroneous? I see not how we can avoid it. If a person lay down his life for the name of Christ, or for what he takes to be the religion of Christ, when he might prolong his days by renouncing his faith, he must stand for a martyr in every

[q] '—— qui mente novissimus exit,
Lucis amor. Statius.

[r] Dodwell hath treated this subject very well in his dissertation De Fortitudine Martyrum.

reasonable man's calendar, though he may have been much mistaken in some of his opinions.

'Unless Driedo had, unawares I think, acquainted me with the provost of Stenelda's Epistle to S. Bernard, I had not known either your [the church of Rome's] cruelty against the Albigenses, or Picards, as I suppose; or their constancy in suffering tortures in themselves most grievous, yet attended with usages as disgraceful; both for the manner or form of proceeding as injuriously inflicted, as the ground or matter of accusations brought against them were unjust and impious. The provost's epistle was to this effect.

"I would gladly be resolved (holy father), might I enjoy your presence, whence it is that in heretics, the devil's members, there should be so great resolution for defence of their heresies, as the like can scarce be found in very religious and faithful Christians. There are (saith he) amongst us, heretics which put no confidence in the suffrages of men deceased, or prayers of saints: fastings and other afflictions of the body usually undertaken for sin, are not, in their opinion, necessary to the righteous: Purgatory after death they acknowledge none: denying the making of our Lord's body in the sacrament of the altar: the church they affirm to be amongst them, having neither fields nor possessions. Of such we have known divers, by the multitude, misled with too much zeal, violently haled against our will unto the flame; whose torments they not only endured with patience, but entertained with joy. I would therefore be resolved by you, holy father, whence so great resolution in the devil's members should spring." Driedo l. iv. De Ecclesiæ Dog. et Scrip. c. 5.

'No question but this provost, which esteemed no better of them than as of heretics or Satan's members, did relate the worst opinions then known to be held by them: and yet he, as I would have the reader note, living in their time, lays no such odious tenets to their charge, as those that lived long after, or were employed by the Romish state to write against Wickliff, Huss, or Jerome of Prague, have charged them and their followers with. Driedo tells us, he finds no direct answer by way of epistle or writing unto this venerable man's demand in particular: but out of S. Bernard's

doctrine, elsewhere delivered concerning like heretics, he finds this resolution, "Nihil simile habet constantia martyrum, et pertinacia hæreticorum, quia in illis pietas, in istis duritia cordis contemptum mortis operatur."—'The constancy of martyrs hath no affinity with the stubbornness of heretics; piety breeds contempt of death in the one, hardness of heart in the other.' Homil. 66. in Cant. Such good-minded men as S. Bernard, I think, had least to do in the examination of such men, most obnoxious to misinformation in the particulars of their carriage: with which the civil magistrates of France, though Romish Catholics, better acquainted, have given them laudable testimonies for their honest and religious lives: and whether these mentioned by that provost were such as S. Bernard spake against, in the place last cited, is more than Driedo knew. Howsoever, in matters of this nature, it is most true, "Bernardus non vidit omnia." T. Jackson's Works, vol. i. p. 278.

Mark, bishop of Arethusa, a considerable man in the Arian, or rather in the Semi-Arian party, endured cruel torments from the irritated Pagans with astonishing bravery; and (besides Sozomen) Theodoret, and Gregory Nazianzen, though Athanasian[a] bishops, have highly extolled him for it. He had escaped by flight; but hearing that many Christians were in danger of suffering upon his account, he returned and surrendered himself, to deliver his brethren.

Tillemont's distress on the constancy of this heretic is remarkable, and his diffidence well expressed. 'This is what St. Gregory, Theodoret, and Sozomen have related concerning the fortitude of Mark of Arethusa. The fact is too well supported to admit of a doubt: but it is no small difficulty to know whether this fortitude were a virtue purely human, like that of the Reguli, the Scævolæ, and other heroes of Paganism, which, in reality, was only an effect of

[a] Chalcidius, a Christian philosopher, who did not admit the creation of matter, was an intimate friend of Hosius of Corduba. Bishops of learning, genius, and abilities (and such Hosius certainly was), did not quarrel with their friends for holding sentiments which caused heretics to be condemned with so much rigor, and to be loaded with so many calumnies. All bishops did not resemble Father Epiphanius. But perhaps they were more tractable in civil and familiar commerce and conversation than in councils, where moderation was hardly ever known, after that of the apostles. Beausobre Hist. de Manich. ii. 238.

their pride; or whether it were a Christian virtue, a gift of the grace of our Lord, and an operation of that charity which maketh saints. For the foundation of true virtue is true faith, without which it is impossible to please God: as likewise it is impossible that true virtue should not please him. And history represents to us every where this prelate as engaged in the belief, in the faction, and in the intrigues of the Arians.' H. Eccl. vii. 370. See also in p. 726. the distress of Tillemont, Baronius, and Bollandus, on this grievous difficulty. They know not where to place Mark of Arethusa; whether among the *saints*, or among the *sinners*, or in the *intermundia* of the *Epicurean gods*.

Mark had demolished a Pagan temple in the reign of Constantius, and had built a church over its ruins; in doing which he seems to have showed more zeal than prudence: but this part of his conduct gives no pain to the Tillemonts and the Baroniuses. The best excuse that can be made for him is, that he had the permission of the emperor for acting as he did, though even that excuse is scarcely satisfactory.

Paul and Silas were severely beaten with rods, and then cast into a dungeon, and put in the stocks, which was a painful posture. At midnight, when such wounds and torments give the most uneasiness, instead of uttering sighs and groans, instead of praying to God to relieve them, they sang praises to him with a loud voice, Acts xvi. 22. Hence we conclude that they were assisted by God, who alleviated their pain, and gave them not only resignation and patience, but exultation and joy. When a martyr suffers greater torments than these for the same cause, and shows the same undaunted and cheerful spirit, is it not just to suppose that he receives the same assistances? The behaviour of the man, the honour of religion, the promise of Christ, the goodness of God, all lead us to this determination.

The far greater part of the martyrologies[t] is indeed so silly and contemptible as to be beneath all notice and censure; and of those which are of a better stamp, some seem to have been drawn up by persons, who, through excessive veneration of the departed saints, and a love of the mar-

[t] *Plaustra mendaciorum* is the properest name for most of them.' See some conjectures concerning the pious lies in the Legends, in Bayle's Dict. *Valerius*.

vellous, or other motives, have inserted false embellishments, and then the transcribers have made interpolations of the same kind. The authors of pious frauds are foolish knaves, who do irreparable mischief to the cause which they want to recommend.

The copies which we have of the antient Acts of Perpetua and Felicitas differ considerably. See Tillemont, H. E. iii. 137. and Basnage Ann. ii. p. 224. 'The African style of these Acts shows their antiquity; and they relate what Perpetua suffered in prison, and some of her dreams, written, if we may believe the author of the Acts, by herself; and also a dream of Saturus, who suffered at the same time. In the dream of Perpetua we see some beginnings of the opinion of purgatory, and of praying for those who are in it, as the commentators have not failed to observe. The question is whether they are really the words of Perpetua, of which it is impossible to be certain. These notions might indeed have been in some measure introduced amongst the common people, and Perpetua might have had a dream conformable to such current notions: but nothing obliges us to believe that all the dreams of martyrs were revelations, or that this in particular was of that kind.' Le Clerc Bibl. Chois. xxvi. 220.

The behaviour of the martyrs related in those Acts, as it is circumstantial and probable, so is it affecting and edifying; but their visions and revelations seem to be partly of the enthusiastic kind, and such as might be expected from the disciples of Montanus. Perhaps the writer, who is supposed by many to have been a Montanist, and the transcribers, enlarged and adulterated that part of the account, either to propagate some favourite notions of their own, or to omit nothing that they had gathered from rumour and common report. This I am inclined to suppose, in respect and reverence for these holy martyrs; but what we much wish we easily believe; and that perhaps may be my case.

In some of the antient Acts of the Martyrs, and in ecclesiastical historians, we have well attested examples of heroic faith and fortitude, and of love stronger than death, which would affect even the coldest heart; and which Joseph Scaliger, a man of good taste, a clear judgment, and no

superstition, could never read without being greatly moved. 'Eorum lectione piorum animus ita afficitur, ut nunquam satur inde recedat: quod quidem ita esse, unusquisque pro captu suo et conscientiæ modo sentire potest. Certe ego nihil unquam in Historia Ecclesiastica vidi, a cujus lectione commotior recedam, ut non amplius meus esse videar.' Anim. in Euseb. p. 121.

Justin Martyr, whilst he was a Pagan, concluded very candidly and reasonably, from the courage and constancy of the persecuted Christians, that they could not be profligate and debauched people; and his Pagan and Platonic judgment on this point was better than the ecclesiastical judgment of several Christian writers. Καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἐγὼ, ταῖς Πλάτωνος χαίρων διδάγμασι, διαβαλλομένους ἀκούων Χριστιανοὺς, ὁρῶν δὲ ἀφόβους πρὸς θάνατον, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἄλλα νομιζόμενα φοβερὰ, ἐνενόουν ἀδύνατον εἶναι ἐν κακίᾳ καὶ φιληδονίᾳ ὑπάρχειν αὐτούς. 'Nam et ego ipse, cum Platonis disciplina delectarer, audiremque criminationes quæ in Christianos jactabantur, mortem autem, cæteraque omnia quæ terribilia putantur, minime eos formidare viderem, statui ipse mecum fieri haudquaquam posse, ut in vitiorum pravitate et voluptatum amore viverent.' Apol. ii.

The Christians, that is, the wise and prudent part of them, were of opinion, that as it was their duty to suffer any torments rather than dissemble or deny their religion, so was it also to avoid persecution, and never to expose themselves uncalled to so hard a trial. Mention is made in the Epistle of the Church of Smyrna, and in other antient records, of some rash and presumptuous Christians, who offered themselves to martyrdom, and who, when they were condemned, lost all courage and deserted their cause, whilst others who had been diffident of themselves and had retired, being discovered and seized, died in a most Christian manner. This also was perfectly suitable to our Saviour's doctrine and promises, who required humility and prudence from his disciples. Peter made bolder professions of fortitude and fidelity than any of the apostles, and therefore he alone fell away in the dark hour of temptation, and denied his Master.

This wonderful behaviour of the antient Christians may justly be accounted a proof of the truth of our religion,

and we should deserve to be blamed and despised, if we parted with it and gave it up tamely upon account of a few objections. Objections may be made even to demonstrations, and

Nihil est tam bonum, quin dicendo malum effici possit.

THE increase of Christianity under all these discouragements, and this cloud of afflictions, is another argument of the same kind, and a subject highly worthy of consideration: 'Adeone levis res et futilis videtur religio Christiana, aut tam vulgaris tamque similis rerum quotidianarum progressio ejus et propagatio, ut quemvis hominem (non jam Christianum dico, sed vel ab omni religione alienum, vel ab ea alienissimum) exquirere pudeat quales homines essent, qua doctrina, quo ingenio, qua disputandi scientia, qua facultate dicendi instructi, qui gravibus illis et constantibus Romanis persuadere potuerint, relictis et repudiatis Diis suis, quos se nunquam aut impune neglexisse, aut frustra gravissimis reipublicæ temporibus invocasse majores omnibus monumentis proclamabant et testabantur, hominum et barbarorum et a se devictorum et Judæorum deum, hominemque simul Judæum a popularibus suis paulo ante servili supplicio necatum, venerari; qui tot tamque dispares nationes, alias immanitate efferatas, alias moribus et disciplina inflatas, alias horrida quadam et agresti virtute feroces, alias luxu et licentia petulantes, alias victoriis et imperio insolentes, alias diuturna servitute fractas et debilitatas, alias ignorantia et tarditate, alias doctrinæ et ingenii fama indociles, ita flexerint et mutaverint, ut religioni patriæ novam et externam, ut omni licentiæ libertatique vivendi (quicum prioribus fere religionibus summa pax et concordia fuit) vitam rigidam et severam et omnia voluptatis vel confinia anxie fugientem, virtutesque quarum nè nomina quidem antea audiverant, ut denique paupertatem divitiis, odium gratiæ, contemtionem honori, exilium patriæ, mortem vitæ anteferrent.' Thirlby, Dedic. Just. M. These reflections are as just as they are elegant; and the inference which the reader ought to make from them is, that a change so happy, so extensive, and so surprising, could have been effected by nothing less than the Divine will and assistance.

'The progress of Christianity,' says Moyle, 'considering its late rise, and the constant opposition it met with, is, even on my moderate computation, prodigious, and to be accounted for by nothing but the Divine Providence, as I may one day show at large on another occasion.' Thunder. Legion, p. 327.

The alteration also which Christianity made in the manners of men, and the stop which it put to polygamy, is very remarkable. Οὔτε οἱ ἐν Παρθίᾳ Χριστιανοὶ πολυγαμοῦσι Πάρθοι ὑπάρχοντες,—οὐχ οἱ ἐν Περσίδι γαμοῦσι τὰς θυγατέρας αὐτῶν, Πέρσαι ὄντες· οὐ παρὰ Βάκτροις καὶ Γάλλοις φθείρουσι τοὺς γάμους·—ἀλλ' ὅπου εἰσὶν, οὔτε ὑπὸ τῶν κακῶς κειμένων νόμων καὶ ἐθῶν νικῶνται. 'Nec in Parthia Christiani, Parthi licet, pluribus utuntur uxoribus, nec in Perside, Persæ licet, filias uxores ducunt, nec apud Bactros aut Gallos nuptiarum honestatem et jura contaminant,—Ita ubicumque degunt, nec legum morumque sceleratorum improbitate vincuntur.' Bardesanes, apud Euseb. Præp. Evang. vi. 10. in his Discourse against Astrological Fate. Thus, according to this ingenious philosopher, the Christians of all countries retained the good qualities and rejected the reigning vices of the several nations of which they were natives.

'The law which permits only one wife is conformable to the nature of the European, but not to the nature of the Asiatic climate. It is for this reason that Mohammedism found so easy an admission in Asia, and such difficulty to extend itself in Europe; that Christianity hath maintained itself in Europe, and hath been destroyed in Asia; and that the Mohammedans have made so much and the Christians so little progress in China.

'In the time of Justinian, many philosophers, uneasy at the restraint laid upon them by Christian laws, retired into Persia, to Chosroës. What induced them most, says Agathias, was that polygamy was there permitted to men who did not abstain even from adultery.

'It is hardly possible that Christianity should ever be established in China. Vows of virginity, the assembling of women in churches, their necessary intercourse with the ministers of religion, their participation of the sacraments, auricular confession, extreme unction, the marrying but one

wife, all this oversets the manners and customs, and strikes at the religion and laws of the country.' L'Esprit des Loix, xvi. 2. xvii. 6. xix. 18.

This acute author is of opinion that Christianity, humanly speaking, can never get footing and ground in the eastern countries, the nature of the climate, the constitution and complexion of the inhabitants, and their temper and manners and laws being repugnant to some precepts of the gospel. I ask then, How came it to pass that in the first and second centuries Christianity found admission and made a progress in those countries, notwithstanding these, and many other difficulties and impediments besides these? Must we not ascribe its success either to miracles wrought in its behalf, or to an extraordinary influence of the Spirit of God upon the minds of those who embraced it?' See Discourse iii. 'on the Christian Religion.'

About A. D. 150, flourished Justin, the first Christian author, after those who are called apostolical, a virtuous, pious, honest man, and incapable of wilfully deceiving, but a hasty writer, and of a warm and credulous temper. He was highly and justly esteemed by the antient Christians, and Eusebius makes honourable mention of him, as of one ἐν τῷ καθ' ἡμᾶς διαπρέψας λόγῳ, 'qui inter religionis nostræ sectatores maxime floruit;' and he speaks of his two Apologies, his Dialogue with Trypho, and some other treatises, and produces some passages from that Dialogue, which show that he had it as we have it now.

He wanted neither learning nor vivacity, nor an unartificial eloquence. The love of truth was his predominant passion, to which he sacrificed all worldly considerations, and for which he laid down his life with great resolution; and therefore whosoever loves truth, should love him and his memory. 'Galen,' says our amiable writer John Hales, 'Galen, that great physician, speaks thus of himself: I know not how, even from my youth up, in a wonderful manner, whether by Divine inspiration, or by fury and possession, or however you may please to style it, I have much contemned the opinion of the many; but truth and knowledge I have above measure affected, verily persuading my-

self that a fairer, a more divine fortune could never befall a man. Some title, some little claim I may justly lay to the words of this excellent person; for the pursuit of truth hath been my only care ever since I understood the meaning of the word. For this I have forsaken all hopes, all friends, all desires, which might bias me, and hinder me from driving right at what I aimed. For this I have spent my money, my means, my youth, my age, and all that I have. If with all this cost and pains my purchase is but error, I may safely say, To err hath cost me more than it has many to find the truth: and truth shall give me this testimony at last, that if I have missed of her, it is not my fault but my misfortune.'

Justin would not perhaps have expressed himself upon this subject with the same strength and elegance; but he had the same heart and the same turn of mind.

In the first Apology, he says to the emperors, 'We desire a fair trial, and no favour: if we be guilty, punish us; if we be innocent, protect us. We do not desire you to punish our calumniators: their own wickedness and ignorance is punishment enough.' Οὐ γὰρ τοὺς κατηγοροῦντας κολάζειν ὑμᾶς ἀξιώσομεν· ἀρκοῦνται γὰρ τῇ προσούσῃ πονηρίᾳ, καὶ τῇ τῶν καλῶν ἀγνοίᾳ. Cicero had a thought of the same kind, but he spoiled it; he says somewhere, 'Odi hominem, et odero. Utinam ulcisci possem; sed ulciscentur illum mores sui.'

'We are slain with the sword,' says Justin, 'we are crucified, we are cast to the wild beasts, we are bound with chains, tortured, and burned; and yet we are not only constant to our profession, but we increase and multiply: the more we are persecuted and destroyed, the more are added to our numbers. As a vine by being pruned and cut close puts forth new shoots, and bears a greater abundance of fruit, so is it with us who are the vine which God and his Christ have planted.' Ὁποῖον ἐὰν ἀμπέλου τὶς ἐκτέμῃ τὰ καρποφορήσαντα μέρη, εἰς τὸ ἀναβλαστῆσαι ἑτέρους κλάδους καὶ εὐθαλεῖς καὶ καρποφόρους ἀναδίδωσι· τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον καὶ ἐφ' ἡμῖν γίνεται· ἡ γὰρ φυτευθεῖσα ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἄμπελος, καὶ σωτῆρος Χριστοῦ, ὁ λαὸς αὐτοῦ ἐστι.

Horace:

Duris ut ilex tonsa bipennibus,
Nigræ feraci frondis in Algido,
Per damna, per cædes, ab ipso
Ducit opes animumque ferro.

The account which Justin gives of himself, as seeking truth among the Philosophers, the Stoics, the Peripatetics, Pythagoreans, and Platonics, and finding it in Christianity, is spritely and entertaining, and so is the manner in which he censures the Jews. 'It was foretold of you,' says he to Trypho, 'that you should be as *the sand of the sea-shore*; and so indeed you are, if as numerous, as barren likewise, and as unfruitful of all that is good, ever ready to receive the refreshing dews and rain of heaven, and never willing and disposed to make any return.' p. 394. ed. Thirl.

I shall not undertake the vindication of Justin concerning the celebrated statue erected to Simon Magus: I am inclined to think that he was mistaken, and that the proud Romans would never have deified a Samaritan knave, and a strolling magician. It seems more probable that they would have sent him to the house of correction, or have bestowed transportation upon him, or a [a] *stone-doublet* sooner than a *statue*. Dr. Thirlby, who pleads Justin's cause, concludes thus: 'Si quis autem quærat quid de hac re ipse sentiam, patroni me potius quam judicis partes egisse, negare non possum, quæque dixi, non tam veritatis gratia, quam Justini dixisse, cujus mihi cum editione defensio ex veteri more necessario suscipienda erat, etc.' It is easy enough to know what this means, though some persons have made a shift to misunderstand it.

In behalf of Justin it might be said, that as worthless men as Simon had religious respect paid to them about the time when Justin wrote, or not long after. Alexander (the impostor perhaps and false prophet) and Peregrinus, called Proteus, another knave, both of whom Lucian has satirically celebrated, and of whom the latter burned himself publicly, and one Neryllinus, an obscure mortal, had statues erected to them at Troas and Parium in the time of Marcus Aurelius, and when Neryllinus was living, to which statues

[a] λάϊνον χιτῶνα.

divine honours were paid, and which were said to give oracles, and to work miracles. So cheap was deification in those days! This we learn from Athenagoras. Τρωὰς καὶ Πάριον· ἡ μὲν Νερυλλίνου εἰκόνας ἔχει, ὃς ἀνὴρ τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς· τὸ δὲ Πάριον, Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ Πρωτέος. Τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου ἔτι ἐπὶ τῆς ἀγορᾶς καὶ ὁ τάφος, καὶ ἡ εἰκών. Οἱ μὲν οὖν ἄλλοι ἀνδριάντες τοῦ Νηρυλλίνου, κόσμημά εἰσι δημόσιον—εἷς δὲ αὐτων καὶ χρηματίζειν καὶ ἰᾶσθαι νοσοῦντας νομίζεται· καὶ θύουσί τε δι' αὐτὰ, καὶ χρύσῳ περιαλείφουσι, καὶ στεφανοῦσι τὸν ἀνδριάντα, οἱ Τρωαδεῖς· ὁ δὲ τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου, καὶ ὁ τοῦ Πρωτέως—ὁ μὲν καὶ αὐτὸς λέγεται χρηματίζειν· τῷ δὲ τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου—δημοτελεῖς ἄγονται θυσίαι καὶ ἑορταὶ, ὡς ἐπηκόῳ θεῷ. 'Troas et Parium. Habet enim illa imagines Neryllini, viri qui nostro seculo vixit: Parium vero, Alexandri et Protei. Alexandri quidem etiamnum in foro et sepulcrum et simulacrum est. Porro Neryllini cæteræ quidem statuæ ornatus sunt publicus,—una vero ex illis tum consulentibus respondere, tum medicari dicitur. Quamobrem et sacra ei faciunt, et auro illinunt, et coronant statuam Troadenses. Protei vero statua—similiter responsa dare perhibetur. Alexandri vero statuæ—sacrificia publice et festa peragunt, tanquam propitio et exaudienti Deo.' p. 122. Ed. Ox.

Epiphanes, the son of the heretic Carpocrates, and a heretic as well as his father, was deified about the middle of the second century, or the time when Justin wrote. The account is remarkable: Ἐπιφανὴς, οὗ καὶ τὰ συγγράμματα νομίζεται, υἱὸς ἦν Καρποκράτους—τὰ μὲν πρὸς πατρὸς Ἀλεξανδρεὺς· ἀπὸ δὲ μητρὸς Κεφαλληνεὺς· ἔζησε δὲ τὰ πάντα ἔτη ἑπτακαίδεκα, καὶ Θεὸς ἐν Σάμῃ τῆς Κεφαλληνίας τετίμηται· ἔνθα αὐτῷ ἱερὸν ῥυτῶν λίθων, βωμοὶ, τεμένη, μουσεῖον ᾠκοδόμηταί τε καὶ καθιέρωται· καὶ συνιόντες εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν οἱ Κεφαλλῆνες κατὰ νουμηνίαν, γενέθλιον ἀποθέωσιν θύουσιν Ἐπιφάνει· σπένδουσί τε καὶ εὐωχοῦνται, καὶ ὕμνοι λέγονται. 'Epiphanes, cujus etiam scripta feruntur, filius erat Carpocratis,—ex patre quidem Alexandrinus, ex matre vero Cephalleneus. Vixit autem solum septendecim annis, et Samæ, quæ est urbs Cephalleniæ, ut Deus est honore affectus. Quo in loco templum ex ingentibus lapidibus, altaria, delubra, museum, ædificatum est et consecratum; et cum est nova luna, convenientes Cephallenei, diem nata-

lem, quo in Deos relatus est Epiphanes, sacrificant, libantque et convivantur, et hymnos canunt.' Clemens Alex. Strom. iii. p. 511.

Here is the canonization, or apotheosis, of a young heretic, performed in an exact and ample manner by these Cephallenean blockheads. Now Simon, it may be said, might have acquired such honours as easily as Epiphanes, who, though he were ingenious, was but a boy.

If any one think that these examples tend to support Justin, they are at his service. Dr. Thirlby, when I once mentioned them to him, thought them observable, and fit to be produced on this subject.

We have the acts of Justin's martyrdom, which seem in the main to be genuine, and to contain a true narration of his courageous behaviour, and of his sufferings.

Without detracting from the merits of this worthy man, we ought to acknowledge what truth and plain matter of fact extort from us, that he and the rest of the Fathers are often poor and insufficient guides in things of judgment and criticism, and in the interpretation of the Scriptures, and sometimes in points of morality also and of doctrine, as Daillé, Whitby, Barbeyrac, and others have fully showed. The men themselves usually deserve much respect, and their writings are highly useful [a] on several accounts; but it is better to defer too little, than too much, to their decisions, and to the authority of Antiquity, that handmaid to Scripture, as she is called. She is like Briareus, and has a hundred hands, and these hands often clash and beat one another.

The genuineness of Justin's Dialogue hath been called in question by Christianus Gotlieb Kochius, Gothofredus Wagnerus, and I know not who, whose names, if Fabricius and Thirlby had not preserved them from oblivion, would have been lost long ago. Father Harduin also, though for a time he thought fit to spare this valuable treatise, yet afterwards, I think, did it the honour to reject it, along with the rest of Justin's works; which is one argument, and not a bad one, in its favour.

[a] The learned defender of Dr. Chapman's Charge hath pointed out their utility, p. 40, &c.

About A. D. 146. Hegesippus wrote an Ecclesiastical History. He was a weak and a credulous man, much such another as Papias. He gives us a history of the martyrdom of James, bishop of Jerusalem, which is no better than a legend, and which Eusebius should not have related, without adding, as he has on some other occasions, 'Of this let every one judge as he thinks proper.'

Towards A. D. 170, arose the sect of the Encratites, followers of Tatian, Justin's disciple. Eusebius iv. 29. They condemned marriage, wine, and animal food. Others before them had held the same doctrines, doctrines expressly foretold and condemned by St. Paul, 1 Tim. iv. 1. But before the fourth century was ended, these and other corruptions were widely spread, or at least the foundation of them was laid, in superstitious and injudicious mortifications, monkery, lying wonders, feigned apparitions, excessive honours paid to departed saints, and to their reliques, &c. as Jos. Mede intimates, and Sir Isaac Newton and others have sufficiently showed.

In the persecution under Marcus Aurelius, Alcibiades and Attalus suffered death. Alcibiades was one who abstained from all food, except bread and water. It was revealed to Attalus whilst they were in prison, that his companion did wrong, and set a bad example, in refusing to make use of God's creatures; upon which Alcibiades obeyed, and ate of such things as were set before him. Eusebius relates this, v. 3. and took it from an Epistle of the Churches of Lions and Vienna in Gaul. They who defend the fasts and abstinences of the antient monks, may try how they can reconcile these things together.

When Marcus Aurelius was at war with the Quadi, A. D. 174, and in the utmost distress and danger, his army was relieved by a plentiful shower of rain, together with hail, thunder, and lightning, which so incommoded his enemies, that the elements seemed to fight for him. The fact is attested by many writers, Pagan and Christian, and by the Columna Antoniniana, where is represented the figure of Jupiter Pluvius. The Pagans ascribed it to the incanta-

tions of some magician, or to the virtues of the emperor, and the Christians to the prayers of the Christian soldiers.

This produced a silly story of the Thundering Legion, and a forged letter of the emperor in favour of the Christians; all which agrees not with the persecution which they endured under him and his colleague Lucius Verus. Observe that Eusebius, v. 5. after producing his vouchers, concludes his narration of the story thus; ἀλλὰ τάῦτα μὲν ὅπῃ τις ἐθέλῃ τιθέσθω, 'but of this let every one judge as he thinks fit.' We are obliged to him for giving us leave to reject it. See Le Clerc, Hist. Eccl. p. 744. and Moyle's Dissertation. Moyle concludes, with wishing no other harm to the believers of the Thundering Legion, than that they may also believe the martyrdom of the Thebean Legion: to which good wish I say, with [a] Le Clerc, *Amen.*

'Qui Bavium non odit, &c.'

There is a stupid and ridiculous epistle of the Emperor Marcus still extant, and of a modern date, which is given up even by Tillemont, who is seldom disposed to make such concessions, and, I believe, by every one else who knows any thing of those matters, one person excepted. We have also an epistle of the same stamp ascribed to Antoninus Pius, which was forged by some Christian before the days of Eusebius, and which Thirlby rejects, and the last editor of Justin defends in his preface, and observes, 'Tantus est decreti imperatoris cum Justini Apologia consensus, ut in sententiam S. Martyris constructum videatur.' p. lxxx. The observation concerning the *consensus* is very true; but who would warrant the inference? The forger of the epistle must have been a poor wretch indeed, if he could not take care that the emperor's answer should favour the petition of Justin. 'Mihi fateor suspectum esse hoc edictum, magisque ad mentem Christianorum esse conceptum quam illud concepturus fuerit Gentilis imperator.' Dodwell Diss. xi. 257.

As to the emperor Marcus, with all his amiable and princely qualities, he did not love the Christians, as appears from unquestionable authority, even from his own book.

[a] Bibl. A. et M. xxvii. 193.

The philosophers had probably contributed to set him against them, and his love of philosophy and the respect which he paid to its professors were excessive, and indeed sometimes ridiculous. 'A Greek orator met him once in the street, and asked him where he was going. A man, replied Marcus, is never too old to learn: I am going to Sextus the philosopher, to be instructed by him. O sun, said the orator, lifting up his hands, a Roman emperor, in his old age, trudges with his book, like a school-boy, to his master's house, to learn his lesson!' The orator might well wonder to see him act so out of character, and more like a pedant than a prince. Suidas, et Philostr. Vit. Sophist. l. ii. 556.

We are told that Marcus Aurelius, without repealing the old laws which condemned convicted Christians, made an edict, that whosoever accused a Christian should be put to death; and that about ten years after, under his son Commodus, who yet was favourable to the Christians, one Apollonius, a man of eminence, being publicly accused of Christianity by a slave (as Jerom says), the delator had his legs broken for his information, and was executed, and that Apollonius, persisting in his religion, was condemned by the Senate. Tertullian Apol. Eusebius v. 5, 21. Le Clerc Hist. Eccl. p. 786. Strange! that so wise a prince as Marcus Aurelius should make so absurd [b] an edict, who might have made a reasonable one in four words, NOLVMVS CHRISTIANOS AMPLIVS VEXARI. Had he not so much interest with the senators as to gain their consent? That is not to be supposed of an emperor so much beloved by his subjects. And if he could not have gained it for this [c] reasonable decree, neither could he have gained it for the other, which, such as it was, would have been very serviceable to the Christians.

[b] The forger of this story had his head full of 'the Book of Esther,' and of 'the Law of the Medes and Persians which altereth not,' and imagined that the only way by which the emperor could protect the Christians was to punish their accusers.

[c] Gallienus, being favourably disposed towards the Christians, gave a rescript which, without these absurdities, secured them in some measure from persecution. Euseb. vii. 13. Could not Marcus have done as much, if he had been so minded?

It is also strange that the informer, knowing the certain death to which he exposed himself, should venture on such a mad and desperate attempt. There must be some mistake in this confused and unaccountable representation.

Shall we then reject the whole story of the martyrdom of Apollonius? We need not go so far: we may rather suppose that as the Romans under bad emperors had suffered intolerably from the base villany and perjuries of informers, and had the [d] whole crew in abomination, and as there had been edicts made against delators, by Titus, Nerva, and Trajan, the persons then in authority might strain a point to cut off this obscure and detested villain, and yet might not be willing to spare Apollonius after he had been publicly accused; for the senate in general was never favourable to Christianity: and therefore some emperors, who were not void of good qualities, oppressed the Christians, to gain the esteem of that body, and to pass for zealous defenders of the Roman laws and customs.

The senate might condemn Apollonius by Trajan's rescript to Pliny, and yet not care to encourage informations. If Apollonius were accused by his own slave, the slave, I think, by the Roman laws was liable to be put to death. Cod. l. x. tit. xi. and the notes. The emperor Tacitus afterwards ordered that slaves should not bear witness against their masters, even in crimes of high treason. 'In eadem oratione cavit ut servi in dominorum capita non interrogarentur, ne in causa majestatis quidem.' Vopiscus Tacito, p. 608.

Trajan forbad the Christians to be sought after, that is, he testified his dislike of it; but he made no law against the accusers of Christians, and subjected them to no penalties.

When Cyprian was brought to his trial before the proconsul of Afric, that magistrate asked him to give him the names of the presbyters of Carthage. Cyprian replied that

[d] Tacitus hated them heartily, and calls them 'genus hominum publico exitio repertum, et pœnis nunquam satis coercitum.' The younger Pliny was of the same mind—but men of honour have ever agreed in disliking and shunning such vermin, though men of power have sometimes been fond of them. See Cicero Orat. pro Roscio, 20.

he would not discover them, and that even the civil laws justly condemned delators. Act. Cypr.

The death of Apollonius is a proof that the epistles which we have of Antoninus Pius and of Marcus Aurelius, which expressly forbid Christians to be put to death for their religion, were forgeries; for the rescripts of emperors, unless repealed, were in some measure Roman laws. 'Quod principi placuit, legis habet vigorem.' Instit. i. tit. ii. See Schulting, Dissert. pro Rescriptis.

In the time of Marcus Aurelius lived Lucian and Apuleius. Lucian was partly a sceptic, partly an Epicurean,* an elegant, ingenious, loose, and immodest writer. It is no wonder that he did not like Christianity; yet he hath said so much, in the way of ridicule, against superstition and the worship of the gods, and the sophistry of the philosophers, that he may possibly be considered in that respect, as a kind of apologist, who contributed, though undesignedly, to the advancement of religion, if it be allowed that

> 'Virtus est vitium fugere, et sapientia prima
> Stultitia caruisse.'

The notion that he was an apostate from Christianity is groundless. See the Life of Lucian by Reitzius. Bourdelotius on this occasion says, 'Qui mendaciis suis invicem credunt, Christianum fuisse arbitrantur, suppositititiorum pravitate decepti.' Saucy enough! 'Qui mendaciis suis invicem credunt,' is taken from Minucius Felix, and is the character which the Pagan in the Dialogue bestows upon all the Christians in general.

Apuleius passed for a philosopher and a magician. The first of these characters he desired and deserved; the second he loudly disclaimed. Some Pagans after his time were so very silly as to oppose to the miracles of Christ those of Apuleius, of which there was not one upon record. Bayle's Dict. *Apuleius*.

Augustine seems to have had a small doubt whether Apuleius were really metamorphosed into an ass. If he

* He praises and extols Epicurus in his Alexander.

had lived in the days of Apuleius and had said so, the philosopher would have returned the compliment upon him. 'Apuleius in libris, quos Asini Aurei titulo inscripsit, sibi ipsi accidisse, ut accepto veneno, humano animo permanente, asinus fieret, aut indicavit, aut finxit. Hæc vel falsa sunt, vel tam inusitata, ut merito non credantur.' De Civ. Dei, xviii. 18. But in the time of Augustine some Christian miracles were related by himself, and received by the populace, which for improbability were not at all inferior to the transformation of Apuleius.

The elegant story of Cupid and Psyche [f] in Apuleius, is undoubtedly mystical and allegorical. Porphyry wrote a poem, which is lost, called ὁ ἱερὸς γάμος, 'the Sacred Nuptials,' by which I suppose was meant the mysterious union of the soul with the Deity; and the enthusiastic sublimity of the poem made some readers conclude that the author was mad; but Plotinus, who was an adept, greatly admired it. Holstenius, Vit. Porph. c. 10.

Irenæus, speaking of the initiations and mysteries of some old heretics, says, Οἱ μὲν αὐτῶν νυμφῶνα κατασκευάζουσι — καὶ πνευματικὸν γάμον φάσκουσιν εἶναι τὸ ὑπ' αὐτῶν γινόμενον, κατὰ τὴν ὁμοιότητα τῶν ἄνω συζυγιῶν. 'Quidam eorum thalamum nuptialem construunt—easque spirituales nuptias esse affirmant, ad formam et exemplum cœlestium conjugiorum.' Vid. Euseb. H. E. iv. 11. Here also were 'spiritual' and 'mystical nuptials [a];' and perhaps *something more*. Enthusiasts and pious mystics have been remarkably fond of 'the nuptial style,' and of applying 'verba nupta' to godly subjects.

The philosophers about and after the time of Apuleius had genius and learning, with a dash of fanaticism [b]. They

[f] Concerning the Metamorphosis and the Apology of Apuleius, see Mr. Warburton Div. Legat. vol. ii.

[a] If Irenæus were not misinformed: for the accounts which the fathers have given of heretics are not to be entirely trusted.

[b] Il est surprenant que ces mystiques Chrètiens, et ces philosophes Payens, ayent été si conformes les uns aux autres, qu'on diroit qu'ils s'étoient donné le mot pour debiter les mêmes folies les uns dans l'orient et les autres dans l'occident. Quel concert admirable entre des gens qui ne s'étoient jamais vûs, et qui n'avoient jamais ouï parler les uns des autres! Bayle Dict. *Taulerus*. See the place, and the references.

were dealers in *Theurgy*, or the evocation of inferior gods, and boasted of an intercourse with dæmons, and an union with God. Many antient Christian writers have spoken handsomely of Porphyry, and have done justice to his abilities, though he were an enemy; which at the same time was doing honour to themselves. Porphyry, as far as we may guess from a passage in Jerom, said, that the miracles which the Christians were reported to work, were the tricks of evil dæmons. Vigilantius, at the end of the fourth century, had condemned the excessive honours paid to the reliques of the saints, for which Jerom reviles him, and says, 'Spiritus iste immundus, qui te hæc cogit scribere, sæpe hoc vilissimo tortus est pulvere, imo hodieque torquetur, et qui in te plagas dissimulat, in cæteris confitetur; nisi forte in morem Gentilium, impiorumque, Porphyrii Eunomiique, has præstigias dæmonum esse confingas, et non vere clamare dæmones, sed sua simulare tormenta.' Contra Vigil.

As we find not in ecclesiastical history that any evil befel Vigilantius, we may conclude that this honest man was gathered to his fathers in peace. If so, he was a fortunate person, for one who set his face against the public, and to be excepted from the number of those, who 'by following Truth too close at the heels, have had their teeth knocked out for their pains.' A politician would have whispered to him, 'Hold your opinion, but hold your tongue.' He came off very well, if he suffered no greater harm than to be called Fool, Blockhead, Madman, Dæmoniac, Lunatic, Heretic, Arian, Eunomian, Samaritan, Jew, Pagan, Infidel, Apostate, Blasphemer, Calumniator, Despiser of Martyrs, Bishops, and Emperors, Glutton, Sot, Liar, Ass, and Dog.

Porphyry made some concessions in favour of Christianity, and acknowledged that the dæmons had reverenced Christ. Holstenius de Vit. Porphyrii, c. 11. or Eusebius, Dem. Evang. p. 134. This philosopher was born A. D. 233. and died about A. D. 303. Constantine ordered his writings against Christianity to be suppressed; in which he was ill advised. 'Si nihil est nostra religione verius, quid rationes reformidamus? said Ludovicus Vives.

Plotinus, as Porphyry relates, desired the emperor Gal-

lienus to rebuild a ruined city in Campania, and to give it to the philosophers, proposing to dwell there himself, with his disciples, and to establish Plato's republic. But though he were much in the emperor's favour, his project met with opposition at court, and came to nothing. 'Thus philosophy, though patronized by princes, could never, in any age, introduce its rules even into one city; and Jesus Christ hath established his all over the world, in spite of all worldly opposition from the great and the learned.' Tillemont H. E. iii. p. 268.

A republic of *modern deists* and *moral philosophers* would be as great a curiosity as this *city of philosophers* would have been; but perhaps not quite so well regulated. Plotinus, if he could have compassed his design, would probably have found it necessary to alter at least one part of the plan in Plato's republic, and to exclude 'the community of wives,' which that philosopher had a fancy to establish.

THE city of Smyrna being overthrown by an earthquake, Marcus Aurelius showed great kindness to the inhabitants, and liberally assisted them in repairing the loss. Aristides the Sophist had the honour to be instrumental in this, by writing to the emperor in behalf of the sufferers.

'Aristides, in a discourse which he addresses to the people of Smyrna, to congratulate their re-establishment, says, that their calamity had been deplored by all the inhabitants of Greece and Asia, as a distress common to them; that every one had been forward to bring provisions to those who remained in the city, and to furnish carriages, houses, and all sorts of conveniences, to those who were forced to quit the place, as though they had been the parents or the children of the sufferers. Every one offered them money, and they who had none promised to furnish it as soon as they were able; and in doing thus, each thought that he did not bestow, but receive a favour.

'Such was the change that Christianity had made in the world; for doubtless the Christians, who were numerous in those provinces, had the best share in these acts of charity, and by their zeal inflamed the Pagans also, to make the old proverb lie, that all the world forgets and neglects

the miserable; which yet till then had been too true.' Tillemont H. des Emp. iii. p. 391.

In the time of Marcus Aurelius lived Bardesanes, a Syrian. We have a large extract from him in Eusebius Præp. Ev. vi. 11. containing arguments against fate and astrology. It is a judicious and ingenious piece, and it shows that this heretic was a man of considerable abilities. Eusebius esteemed him much as an author, (and so did Jerom) and seems to judge candidly and charitably of him as to religion; for he says that Bardesanes fell into the Valentinian heresy, and afterwards saw the folly of it, and rejected it, but could not entirely shake off all, his errors. Hist. Eccl. iv. 30. He was one of those who admitted two Principles, the one good and the other evil; and from him the Manichæans borrowed some of their notions. The author of the Recognitions has pillaged Bardesanes, and has put his remarks and his arguments against astrological fate, into the mouth of his pretended Clemens, ix. 18. but honour and probity is not to be expected from such writers. Cave had a suspicion that Bardesanes was himself the author of the Recognitions. I am inclined to have a better opinion of him, and to think that he could not be the author of so many shameless lies. See an account of this philosopher, of his accomplishments, and of his errors, in Beausobre, Hist. du Manicheisme, ii. p. 128.

In those days lived Melito, bishop of Sardes. He is thought by some to have been a prophet. Amongst many treatises which are lost, he wrote one concerning prophecy. Euseb. iv. 26. καὶ λόγος αὐτοῦ περὶ προφητείας, which Valesius rightly translates, 'Item alius (liber) de prophetia.' But in his notes he says, 'Rufinus hæc cum verbis superioribus conjunxit hoc modo: *De fide et generatione Christi, et de prophetia ejus*, cui tamen non assentior. Rectius Hieronymus in libro de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis hunc locum ita vertit: *Item de prophetia sua librum unum.* Certe Melitonem prophetam a plerisque habitum fuisse docet Tertullianus. Hieronymus in Melitone, *Hujus*, inquit, *elegans et declamatorium ingenium laudans Tertullianus in septem libris quos scripsit adversus Ecclesiam pro*

Montano, dicit a plerisque nostrorum prophetam putari.'

All this amounts to little or nothing, and will not prove that Melito was a prophet. If he had made any predictions, Eusebius would have taken notice of them. As a *prophet* means sometimes only an *inspired teacher*, in that sense Melito might have been a prophet; and the antient Christians accounted him one. Polycrates, a bishop of the second century, says of him—τὸν ἐν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι πολιτευσάμενον—'qui Spiritu sancto afflatus cuncta gessit;' and of a daughter of Philip, ἐν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι πολιτευσαμένη. Apud Euseb. v. 24. But these are expressions somewhat *vague*, and which admit of *more* or *less*.

Concerning this illustrious bishop and apologist, see Disc. i. on the Christ. Rel. p. 35.

UNDER COMMODUS, the Christians suffered little, and many considerable and wealthy families were converted. Eusebius, v. 2.

ABOUT the year 171, arose the sect of the Montanists, a sect pretending to prophecy and extraordinary illuminations, and to excessive rigour in doctrine, discipline, and practice. It consisted, as we may suppose, of some hypocrites mixed with several enthusiasts; and Tertullian was easily drawn in to side with them. They were accused by hasty and credulous adversaries of abominations from which they were free, of killing and eating children; calumnies which only served to confirm them in their obstinacy and in their errors. This sect, though it spread itself much for a time, did some service perhaps to Christianity; for it produced in its opposers, even for the very sake and pleasure of contradiction, an antifanatical spirit, a prudence in avoiding danger when it might be lawfully shunned, a charitable disposition towards repenting sinners, a caution not to be imposed upon by impudent or frantic pretences to inspiration, and a dislike of superstitious and uncommanded austerities, though these indeed, some time after, overwhelmed the Christian world like a torrent.

Besides Tertullian's own vehement and rigid disposition, the ill usage which he received from the ecclesiastics of

the church of Rome contributed to make him a Montanist, as Jerom says, 'Invidiâ et contumeliis clericorum ecclesiæ Romanæ ad Montani dogma delapsum.' De Script. Eccl. This may be true; and it may be a mistake: for how should Jerom know Tertullian's motives? Thus however he lost the title of *Saint*, a title which hath been often as wretchedly bestowed as other titles and favours. Charity bids us suppose that he lost not what is infinitely more important. Several have thought too hardly concerning him, never considering that, with all his abilities, he was deficient in judgment, and had a partial disorder in his understanding, which excuses almost as much as downright phrensy. He was learned, for those times, acute, and ingenious, and somewhat satyrical, hasty, credulous, impetuous, rigid, and censorious, fanatical and enthusiastical, and a bad writer[c], as to style, not perhaps through incapacity of doing better, but through a false taste and a perverse affectation. He fell into many errors; but it is to be hoped that, in another world, the mistakes, as well as the doubts, of poor mortals are rectified, and forgiven too, and that whosoever loves truth and virtue,

> 'illic postquam se lumine vero
> Implevit, stellasque vagas miratus et astra
> Fixa polo, vidit quanta sub nocte jaceret
> Nostra dies.'

But the manner in which he treated some of those heretics whom he attacks, is not to be excused.

In his books against Marcion, he declaims against the very country in which he supposed him to have been born, and calls him, by way of reproach, a *sailor*, or *water-man*, and a *Scythian*. He should have remembered, as Beausobre observes, that Peter the apostle was a fisherman, and the Scythian Anacharsis a philosopher, and that such reflections are good for nothing.

TERTULLIAN informs us that a Christian, called Proculus, cured the emperor Severus of some distemper with oil,

[c] Mr. de Balzac dit que l'obscurité de Tertullien est comme la noirceur de l'ébene, qui jette un grand éclat. Menagiana.

for which the emperor was favourable to the Christians, and kept Proculus, as long as he lived, in the palace. 'Ipse etiam Severus, pater Antonini, Christianorum memor fuit; nam et Proculum Christianorum, qui Torpacion cognominabatur, Euhodeæ procuratorem, qui eum per oleum aliquando curaverat, requisivit, et in palatio suo habuit ad mortem ejus: quem et Antoninus optime noverat, lacte Christiano educatus.' Ad Scap. iv.

Was this cure miraculous?

Instead of making a direct answer to the question, we will supply the reader with some facts relating to it, which ought to be taken into consideration.

Tertullian seems to have thought the cure miraculous, for he joins it to other cures of that kind, which, as he says, were wrought by Christians. 'Hæc omnia tibi et officio suggeri possunt, et ab iisdem advocatis, qui et ipsi beneficia habent Christianorum, licet adclament quæ volunt. Nam et cujusdam Notarius, cum a dæmone præcipitaretur, liberatus est; et quorundam propinquus et puerulus. Et quanti honesti viri, de vulgaribus enim non dicimus, aut a dæmoniis aut valetudinibus remediati sunt. Ipse etiam Severus,' &c.

The relation of Tertullian, as to the cure, must be admitted, since he is so circumstantial, and part of his account is confirmed by Pagan writers. See Tillemont Hist. des Emp. iii. 89. and H. Eccl. iii. 114. and Fabricius Bibl. Gr. viii. 460. where it appears that there was such a man as Euhodus, who was Libertus of the emperor Severus, and by him appointed to educate his eldest son Caracalla. Proculus was steward to this Euhodus, or Euhodeas, or to Euhodea, who might be the daughter of Euhodus. Caracalla had a Christian nurse, and a Christian boy for a play-fellow; and it is probable that Euhodus or Euhodea was a Christian, as well as Proculus.

Tertullian and Severus were not only contemporaries, but countrymen, and Africans; and Tertullian, who seems also to have been very curious and inquisitive, might know more particularities concerning the emperor than many other persons.

It had been a custom with Christians in the apostolical

age to anoint the sick with oil, and to pray over them; after which I know not whether it be mentioned in the three first centuries, except this passage of Tertullian be allowed a proof of it, or the authority of the Constitutions be admitted in this particular: yet it is probable that the practice was continued.

Many medical uses of oil were very well known before that time, as may be seen in Pliny's Natural History, ii. p. 308, &c. ed. Hard. and the state of physic in the days of Severus was flourishing enough, and Galen lived then and was in high esteem.

If oil had been thought proper for his distemper, Severus would probably have known it without the advice of Proculus.

The case seems to have been somewhat extraordinary, and not accounted curable by oil, since Severus was so fond of the Christian who recovered him, and took him into the palace, perhaps that he might have him at hand, if he should want him for himself or his family.

Severus kept medicines by him, which he used to bestow on those who stood in need of them; and it is said that many persons had found them beneficial in dangerous diseases and disorders. Some emperors before Severus had done the same. See Galen de Theriaca.

Severus was for a time very favourable to the Christians, though afterward upon some disgust he used them ill. He was haughty, cruel, stubborn, and unrelenting. He was 'vere Pertinax, vere Severus,' as the common people used to say of him, alluding to his names. If he had been obstinately bent upon subverting Christianity, he would have proved a most terrible enemy; but the remembrance of the service which he had received from a Christian, and the dutiful behaviour of the Christians, who had never been in arms against him, or assisted his rivals, and other motives, might have contributed to make him less violent; for, if Spartian inform us rightly, his decree was thus; 'Judæos fieri sub gravi pœna vetuit: idem etiam de Christianis sanxit;' which might be interpreted as only prohibiting the Jews and Christians to make any more converts, and the Pagans to embrace either of those religions.

Many writers suppose that his persecution was sharp; but Dodwell[a] thinks that it was not rigorous, and the writer de Mortibus Persecutorum passes it over in silence, as though it had not been considerable.

Thus stands the evidence, from which the reader may draw what conclusion he thinks proper.

He may also examine these points:

Was Proculus a presbyter?

Whether he were or were not, could he anoint a Pagan with oil, in pursuance of the direction given by St. James v. 14.?

Or was it in imitation of the common practice of the Jews, or of the disciples whom Christ sent to preach, Mark vi. 13.?

In the Constitutions there is a form of consecrating water and oil, in which the bishop or the presbyter prays that God would give to each of them δύναμιν ὑγείας ἐμποιητικὴν, νόσων ἀπελαστικὴν, δαιμόνων φυγαδευτικὴν, πάσης ἐπιβουλῆς διωκτικήν· 'vim effectricem sanitatis, morborum expultricem, dæmonum fugatricem, omnium insidiarum profligatricem.' viii. 29.

In the passage of Tertullian concerning Proculus, S. Basnage for Euhodeæ reads Euhodi, and for Torpacion, Torpeion, and thus explains the place, 'Hæc ergo est mens Tertulliani: Cum Severus miraculum a Proculo fuisse editum, ex Euhodo per oleum sanato comperisset, hunc requisivit Proculum, quem et in palatio suo habuit usque ad mortem ejus.' Annal. ii. p. 201.

Thus he supposes that Proculus cured Euhodus, and not Severus[a]; but this interpretation seems to do some violence to the words, and is not the most obvious sense, and *eum* is more naturally referred to the emperor. Besides, the expression *memor fuit*, and the affection and kindness which the emperor showed to this man, make it probable that he himself had been cured by him.

[a] In his Dissertation 'De Paucitate Martyrum;' in which if he sometimes fall short of the truth, yet he approaches nearer to it than his antagonists, who greatly overshoot it in their notions 'De Multitudine Martyrum,' and in the regard which they pay to lying legends.

[a] Fleury, in his Histoire Ecclesiastique, gives the same interpretation to the words of Tertullian.

In the persecution under Severus, many fled to avoid it, or gave money to redeem themselves. Tertullian, like a frantic Montanist, condemned these expedients. De Fuga, 5. 6. One Rutilius, distrusting his own courage, made use of them both; but afterwards, being seized, he endured cruel torments and death with great constancy and intrepidity, leaving an excellent example of prudence and piety.

Theophilus wrote three books, and addressed them to his friend Autolycus, a learned Pagan, A. D. 168. He thus[a] disputes with him concerning the doctrine of the resurrection.

'Show me,' said Autolycus, 'even one man raised from the dead, that I may see and believe.'

Autolycus, in all probability, had no thoughts of calling in good earnest upon his friend, or upon any of the Christians, to perform such a miracle; but like the generality of the Gentiles, accounted the future resurrection of the dead, expected by the Christians, to be an idle fancy and an utter impossibility, a hope without ground and without example, and the resurrection of Christ to be a fable: therefore, said he, give me an instance, and show me one man at least who hath been restored to life. Observe that this was a common argument in the mouth of the Pagans. 'Tanta ætas abiit,' says Cæcilius in Minucius Felix, 'secula innumera fluxerunt: quis unus ullus ab inferis vel Protesilai sorte remeavit, horarum saltem permisso commeatu, vel ut exemplo crederemus?' xi.

So in Lactantius:—'illud reponitur, Tot jam secula trans-

[a] Ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ἀρνεῖσθαί σε νεκροὺς ἐγείρεσθαι· φῂς γὰρ, δεῖξόν μοι κἂν ἕνα ἐγερθέντα ἐκ νεκρῶν, ἵνα ἰδὼν πιστεύσω· πρωτον μὲν τί μέγα, εἰ θεασάμενος τὸ γεγονὸς πιστεύσεις; εἶτα πιστεύεις μὲν Ἡρακλέα καύσαντα ἑαυτὸν, ζῆν· καὶ Ἀσκληπιὸν κεραυνωθέντα ἐγηγέρθαι. τὰ δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ σοι λεγόμενα ἀπιστεῖς; ἴσως καὶ ἐπιδείξω σοι νεκρὸν ἐγερθέντα καὶ ζῶντα, καὶ τοῦτο ἀπιστήσεις. ὁ μὲν οὖν Θεός σοι πολλὰ τεκμήρια ἐπιδείκνυσιν εἰς τὸ πιστεύειν αὐτῷ· εἰ γὰρ βούλει, κατανόησον τὴν μὲν καιρῶν καὶ ἡμερῶν καὶ νυκτῶν τελευτὴν, πῶς καὶ αὐτὰ τελευτᾷ καὶ ἀνίσταται.—Μὴ οὖν ἀπίστει, ἀλλὰ πίστευε· καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ ἠπίστουν τοῦτο ἔσεσθαι, ἀλλὰ νῦν κατανοήσας αὐτὰ πιστεύω, ἅμα καὶ ἐπιτυχὼν ἱεραῖς γραφαῖς τῶν ἁγίων προφητῶν, οἱ καὶ προεῖπον διὰ Πνεύματος Θεοῦ τὰ προγεγονότα ᾧ τρόπῳ γέγονε, καὶ τὰ ἐνεστῶτα τίνι τρόπῳ γίνεται, καὶ τὰ ἐπερχόμενα ποίᾳ τάξει ἀπαρτισθήσεται. i. 13.

ierunt: Quis unquam unus ab inferis resurrexit, ut exemplo ejus fieri posse credamus?' Div. Inst. vii. 22.

So in Tertullian: 'At enim Christianus, si de homine hominem, ipsumque de Caio Caium reducem repromittat, statim illic vesica quæritur: lapidibus magis nec saltem cæstibus a populo exigetur.' Apol. c. 48. The general purpose of which, though some of the expressions be obscure and perhaps corrupted, is plainly this, that if a Christian speak of the certainty of a resurrection, he is presently treated by the Pagans as a knave, or a fool, or a madman. Speaking of a resurrection and a future judgment, he adds; 'Hæc et nos risimus aliquando. De vestris fuimus.' Apol. c. 18. Let us see what Theophilus replies.

1. 'What great thing would it be, if you should give credit to what you have beheld?'

Theophilus here seems to have thought upon the words of Christ, 'Because thou hast seen, thou hast believed,' &c.

2. 'You who are so incredulous, can yet imagine that Hercules lives, and that Æsculapius was raised after death.'

To this Autolycus would perhaps have replied, My friend, let me tell you a secret; I believe no more of the matter than you do: but though I should think that the souls of these two heroes became gods after their death, what is that to the resurrection which you Christians expect?

If Autolycus really believed such things, he had much more credulity than the Roman publicans. 'An Amphiaraus deus erit, et Trophonius? Nostri quidem publicani, quum essent agri in Bœotia deorum immortalium excepti lege censoria, negabant immortales esse ullos, qui aliquando homines fuissent.' Cicero De Nat. Deorum, iii.

Supposing him to have admitted popular Paganism, and rejected Christianity, Theophilus might have told him, that he 'strained at a gnat, and swallowed a camel.'

3. 'If you will not believe the testimony of God, I question whether you would believe, though I should show you a person raised from the dead.'

Theophilus had in his mind, 'If they believe not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead.'

4. 'The death and resurrection of the seasons of the year, of day and night, of the sun and moon, of seeds and fruits, &c. are figures and divine indications of the resurrection which we expect.'

5. 'I, who was a Pagan, and an unbeliever like you, now believe a resurrection, being induced to it by the indications of it which I have mentioned, and by the prophets, whose writings show that they were inspired of the Holy Ghost, and had the knowledge of things past, present, and future.

Theophilus by the prophets meant not only the writers of the Old but of the New Testament, and immediately subjoins some passages taken from St. Paul's Epistles.

From all this it must, I think, be acknowledged that Theophilus never saw a man raised from the dead. If he had, it would have so affected him that he could not have avoided the mentioning it, and would have urged it to his friend, whom he was desirous to confute and to convert, and who would surely have paid some degree of regard to his testimony. At least he would have mentioned it as a reason for his own belief, and a motive to himself to continue stedfast in all the doctrines of Christianity, and particularly in the doctrine of a resurrection, a reason and a motive stronger surely than the return of seasons, and the setting and rising of the sun, &c. 'Soles occidere et redire possunt,' &c. Instead of saying, I myself have seen it, he talks of the small merit in believing what one beholds, and of the reasonableness of assenting to inspired men without such overbearing evidence.

It is probable, from his silence, that he had heard of no instance of such a miracle in his days; probable, I say, but not certain: because though he had heard of it, he might possibly have thought it to no purpose to tell his friend that there were Christians who affirmed such things, and he might suspect that Autolycus would not have admitted the testimony of persons with whom he had no acquaintance, and for whom he had little regard.

Theophilus makes no mention of any miracles, except the casting out dæmons, not even of the miracles of Christ and his apostles; which is strange: and when he speaks of curing the dæmoniacs, it is with a sort of moderation and

reserve—οἱ δαιμονῶντες ἐνίοτε καὶ μέχρι τοῦ δεῦρο ἐξορκίζονται—καὶ ὁμολογεῖ τὰ πλάνα πνεύματα εἶναι δαίμονες—This is done, says he, 'sometimes, even still'—ii. p. 87. Is that all he had to say? And yet some will have it that dæmoniacs and resurrections were as common in those days as fevers and palsies. It must be confessed that his books are not drawn up in a manner altogether proper to convince unbelievers.

Clemens Romanus, Athenagoras, Tertullian, Tatian, Minucius Felix, and others, when they treat the same subject, the doctrine of a resurrection, mention no resurrections in their days to confirm it, but Clemens mentions the resurrection of Christ.

As Theophilus was disputing with a Pagan about the resurrection, he might have told him that the thing had not appeared impossible to some Pagans, and have referred him to a remarkable passage in Plato; ἐκ τῶν τετελευτηκότων αὖ, κειμένων δὲ ἐν γῇ, πάλιν ἐκεῖ ξυνισταμένους καὶ ἀναβιωσκομένους—'ex mortuis nimirum, sed terrâ conditis, illos iterum tum restitutos, et in novam vitam restauratos.'—And again; ἐκ γῆς γὰρ ἀνεβιώσκοντο πάντες, οὐδὲν μεμνημένοι τῶν πρόσθεν. 'Omnes enim ex terra redivivi nascebantur, rerum præteritarum immemores.' Polit. p. 271, 272. Plato is speaking of an 'old history,' παλαίου μύθου. The Athenians could not be surprised at St. Paul's mentioning ἀνάστασις, if they had read Plato. See the passage of Minucius cited above, and some Pagan stories of resurrections in the notes of Davies, and Grotius de Ver. R. C. ii. § 7, 10. and Bayle's Dict. *Theopompe*, note L.

It is certain that the most convincing proof of the resurrection which could have been offered to Autolycus, or which Autolycus could have asked, would have been to raise a dead man before his eyes; but in this kind of dialogues, real or fictitious, we are not to suppose that the Pagan always said what was most suitable, and that the Christian always replied in the most pertinent manner.

THEOPHILUS, iii. 3. says; Τί μοι λοιπὸν καταλέγειν τὰ περὶ Ποσειδῶνός, καὶ Ἀπόλλωνος, ἢ Διονύσου καὶ Ἡρακλέος, Ἀθηνᾶς τῆς Φιλοκόλπου, καὶ Ἀφροδίτης τῆς ἀναισχύντου—; 'Quid jam recenseam Neptuni, Apollinis, Bacchi, Hercu-

lis, Minervæ sinus amantis, Veneris pudorem projicientis facinora?' φιλοκόλπου is an epithet which ought to have been explained by the editors. Theophilus means the Ephesian Diana, Diana πολύμαστος, who is represented with a multitude of breasts one above another, and makes an ugly figure, more like a she-devil than a goddess. 'Diana—Ephesia mammis multis et veribus [uberibus] exstructa.' Minucius, c. 21. where see Davies. Theophilus should rather have called her Ἄρτεμις than Ἀθηνᾶ: but the Pagans confounded their deities together, and made their Ceres, Diana, Hecate, Isis, Proserpina, Minerva, &c. to be one and the same; and thence came the Symbolic and Pantheistic images of gods and goddesses, representing the attributes of several deities.

CONTEMPORARY with Theophilus was Irenæus, who gives us an account of miracles wrought in the church, as healing the sick, casting out devils, speaking various languages, raising the dead, &c.

It hath been hitherto taken for granted on all sides that he speaks of all these miracles, as being performed in his days. Therefore Dr. Middleton has laboured to invalidate his testimony, and to show that he was a weak, credulous, and injudicious man; and I fear it will be no easy task to [a] clear him entirely from the imputation of credulity and inaccuracy. But on considering the words of Irenæus, a conjecture offered itself to me, which may perhaps deserve notice: Irenæus, writing against heretics, observes that they never had miraculous gifts amongst them, and thereby might be distinguished from the disciples of Christ. Then he proceeds to speak of the miracles performed by the latter, mixing those which had been wrought by the apostles and their immediate successors with those which

[a] The credulity and inaccuracy of the Christians of those times permit us not to trust to their relations, especially when they contain any thing preternatural. One cannot help wishing that they had been more circumspect and less credulous; but perhaps Providence would not preserve them from these errors and defects, that it might plainly appear, that they were men in no manner comparable to the first disciples of Jesus Christ, and consequently altogether incapable of forging the books of the New Testament. Le Clerc, Bibl. A. et M. xxiii. p. 27.

in his opinion, and according to common report, still continued in the church. When he speaks of resurrections he says, the soul 'returned,' the dead 'were raised,' and 'remained' σὺν ἡμῖν, 'with us[b],' that is, 'with us Christians;' but he fixes not the time when they were recalled to life, and were to be seen. It is not evident therefore, even upon his own account of it, that the dead were raised, or remained alive at the time he wrote. It is remarkable, that when he speaks of casting out devils, healing the sick, and other miracles, he uses the 'present tense,' ἐπιτελοῦσιν, ἐλαύνουσιν, ἰῶνται, &c. but when he mentions resurrections, he has the caution always to use the 'aorist,' ἐπέστρεψεν, ἐχαρίσθη, ἠγέρθησαν, παρέμειναν.

Irenæus says that the dead were raised, and remained alive for some years: Quadratus, who wrote his Apology about fifty years before him, speaks thus; Τοῦ δὲ Σωτῆρος, ἡμῶν τὰ ἔργα ἀεὶ παρῆν· ἀληθῆ γὰρ ἦν· οἱ θεραπευθέντες· οἱ ἀναστάντες ἐκ νεκρῶν· οἱ οὐκ ὤφθησαν μόνον θεραπευόμενοι, καὶ ἀνιστάμενοι, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀεὶ παρόντες· οὐδὲ ἐπιδημοῦντος μόνον τοῦ Σωτῆρος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀπαλλαγέντος, ἦσαν ἐπὶ χρόνον ἱκανόν. ὥστε καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἡμετέρους χρόνους τινὲς αὐτῶν ἀφίκοντο. 'Servatoris autem nostri opera semper conspicua erant, quippe quæ vera essent: ii scilicet qui morbis liberati, aut qui ex morte ad vitam revocati fuerant. Qui quidem non solum dum sanabantur, aut dum ad vitam revocabantur, conspecti sunt ab omnibus, sed secuto deinceps tempore. Nec solum quamdiu in terris moratus est Servator noster, verum etiam post ejus discessum diu superstites fuerunt: adeo ut nonnulli eorum etiam ad nostra usque tempora pervenerint.' Apud Euseb. iv. 3. Both of them use the same word ἱκανός. χρόνον ἱκανὸν, says Quadratus; ἱκανοῖς ἔτεσι, says Irenæus. Did Irenæus copy Quadratus[d]?

[b] Νῦν dici potest, de re quæ ætate nostra facta est, idemque valet ac τὸ καθ' ἡμᾶς, quod Eusebius usurpare solet de rebus multo ante gestis. Ut cum dicit de Porphyrio philosopho ὁ καθ' ἡμᾶς γενόμενος—Justinus de Antinoo ita loquitur, τοῦ νῦν γενομένου, qui nostra ætate vixit. Valesius ad Euseb. iv. 8.

[d] Τοσοῦτον δὲ ἀποδέουσι τοῦ νεκρὸν ἐγεῖραι, καθὼς ὁ Κύριος ἤγειρε καὶ οἱ Ἀπόστολοι διὰ πρασευχῆς· καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀδελφότητι πολλάκις, διὰ τὸ ἀναγκαῖον τῆς κατὰ τόπον ἐκκλησίας πάσης αἰτησαμένης μετὰ νη-

Irenæus says that evil spirits were cast out of Pagans, so as to return no more; and that they who were thus cured often embraced Christianity. Tertullian ad Scap. iv. and Origen in Reg. affirm the same.

Irenæus says not, as some have imagined, that *all* Christians could work miracles: he only says, *οἱ ἀληθῶς αὐτοῦ μαθηταὶ*, 'they who are true disciples of Christ,' which is not the same as *πάντες*, and only means that none except true Christians had such powers. These learned men seem to have been misled by the translation of Valesius. *Διὸ καὶ ἐν ἐκείνου ὀνόματι οἱ ἀληθῶς αὐτοῦ μαθηταὶ παρ' αὐτοῦ λαβόντες τὴν χάριν*—'unde etiam in ejus nomine, *quotquot* veri sunt ejus discipuli, acceptâ ab eo gratiâ.'—So Valesius, who had no reason to put in 'quotquot.' It should be, 'Unde etiam in illius nomine, veri ejus discipuli,' &c.

The general sense of the passage produced here from Irenæus is this: Heretics never had any miraculous powers, much less the power of raising the dead: yet this our

στείας καὶ λιτανείας πολλῆς, ἐπέστρεψε τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ τετελευτηκότος, καὶ ἐχαρίσθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος ταῖς εὐχαῖς τῶν ἁγίων.—εἰ δὲ καὶ τὸν Κύριον φαντασιωδῶς τὰ τοιαῦτα πεποιηκέναι φήσουσιν, ἐπὶ τὰ προφητικὰ ἀνάγοντες αὐτοὺς, ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐπιδείξομεν πάντα οὕτως περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ προειρῆσθαι καὶ γεγονέναι βεβαίως, καὶ αὐτὸν μόνον εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ. διὸ καὶ ἐν τῷ ἐκείνου ὀνόματι οἱ ἀληθῶς αὐτοῦ μαθηταὶ, παρ' αὐτοῦ λαβόντες τὴν χάριν, ἐπιτελοῦσιν ἐπ' εὐεργεσίᾳ τῇ τῶν λοιπῶν ἀνθρώπων, καθὼς εἷς ἕκαστος αὐτῶν τὴν δωρεὰν εἴληφε παρ αὐτοῦ. οἱ μὲν γὰρ δαίμονας ἐλαύνουσι βεβαίως καὶ ἀληθῶς· ὥστε πολλάκις καὶ πιστεύειν αὐτοὺς ἐκείνους καθαρισθέντας ἀπὸ τῶν πονηρῶν πνευμάτων, καὶ εἶναι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ· οἱ δὲ καὶ πρόγνωσιν ἔχουσι τῶν μελλόντων, καὶ ὀπτασίας καὶ ῥήσεις προφητικάς· ἄλλοι δὲ τοὺς κάμνοντας διὰ τῆς τῶν χειρῶν ἐπιθέσεως ἰῶνται, καὶ ὑγιεῖς ἀποκαθιστᾶσιν. ἤδη δὲ καθὼς ἔφαμεν καὶ νεκροὶ ἠγέρθησαν, καὶ παρέμειναν σὺν ἡμῖν ἱκανοῖς ἔτεσι. καὶ τί γάρ; οὐκ ἔστιν ἀριθμὸν εἰπεῖν τῶν χαρισμάτων, ὧν κατὰ παντὸς τοῦ κόσμου ἡ ἐκκλησία παρὰ Θεοῦ λαβοῦσα, ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ σταυρωθέντος ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, ἑκάστης ἡμέρας ἐπ' εὐεργεσίᾳ τῇ τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐπιτελεῖ, μήτε ἐξαπατῶσα τινὰς, μήτε ἐξαργυριζομένη. ὡς γὰρ δωρεὰν εἴληφε παρὰ Θεοῦ, δωρεὰν καὶ διακονεῖ—καθὼς καὶ πολλῶν ἀκούομεν ἀδελφῶν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ προφητικὰ χαρίσματα ἐχόντων· καὶ παντοδαπαῖς λαλούντων διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος γλώσσαις· καὶ τὰ κρύφια τῶν ἀνθρώπων εἰς φανερὸν ἀγόντων ἐπὶ τῷ συμφέροντι· καὶ τὰ μυστήρια τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκδιηγουμένων. 'Tantum abest, ut mortuum excitent per orationem, quemadmodum Dominus et apostoli fecerunt. Sed et sæpenumero inter fratres, tota simul unius loci ecclesia ob

Lord and his apostles have done, this the brethren have often by their united prayers obtained from God: the dead have been raised, and have continued with us for some years. The true disciples of Christ receive various gifts, and daily impart them as freely as they have received them; some foretell future events, others heal the sick, others expel evil spirits, &c.

I suspect that if Irenæus had been called upon to explain himself as to these gifts, and to prove his assertions, he would have said, that the ejecting of dæmons, and the healing the sick, were still performed upon certain occasions, but that the speaking of languages, the disclosing the secrets of men's hearts, and the raising of the dead, had been performed by apostles and apostolical men; and that he had mentioned all these miracles without discrimination of time, as gifts conferred on the faithful, and never on heretics.

In speaking of these miracles he alludes to the New Testament, and talks in the apostolical style: Καθὼς εἷς ἕκαστος αὐτῶν τὴν δωρεὰν εἴληφε παρ' αὐτοῦ. from 1 Pet. iv. 10.

aliquam necessitatem id flagitante cum jejuniis multis et orationibus, reversa est in corpus anima defuncti, et sanctorum precibus hominis vita donata est.—Quod si simulatione quadam ac præstigiis hæc Dominum fecisse dicturi sunt, ad prophetarum oracula eos deducentes, ex illis demonstrabimus cuncta de ipso ita prædicta et gesta esse certissime, eumque solum esse Filium Dei. Unde etiam in ejus nomine, quotquot veri sunt ejus discipuli, accepta ab eo gratia ad salutem atque utilitatem reliquorum omnium ea faciunt, prout unusquisque ipsorum ab eo munus acceperit. Alii enim dæmonas expellunt certissime ac verissime; adeo ut qui ejusmodi malis spiritibus liberati sunt, sæpe fidem amplectantur, et in ecclesia permaneant. Alii præscientiam futurorum et visiones sortiti sunt, et propheticas prædictiones. Alii infirmos per impositionem manuum curant, ac pristinæ sanitati restituunt. Sed et mortui aliquoties, ut supra diximus, excitati sunt, et pluribus deinceps annis nobiscum remanserunt. Quid plura? non potest numerus iniri donorum, quæ per universum orbem ecclesia a Deo accipiens, in nomine ejus qui sub Pontio Pilato crucifixus est Jesu Christi, quotidie ad opitulationem gentium operatur; nec fallens quenquam, nec pecuniam corradens. Ut enim gratis accepit a Deo, sic etiam gratis ministrat.—Sicuti multos ex fratribus audimus, in ecclesia, qui prophetiæ dona consecuti sunt, et omni linguarum genere per Spiritum loquuntur, et ad hominum utilitatem, occulta in lucem proferunt, atque arcana Dei mysteria exponunt.' Irenæus ii. 57. p. 166. ed. Massuet; or Euseb. v. 7.

ἕκαστος καθὼς ἔλαβε χάρισμα.—Again; Μήτε ἐξαπατῶσα τινὰς, μήτε ἐξαργυριζομένη. from 2 Cor. xii. 16.—δόλῳ ὑμᾶς ἔλαβον. Μή τινα ὧν ἀπέσταλκα πρὸς ὑμᾶς δι' αὐτοῦ ἐπλεονέκτησα ὑμᾶς; Again; Ὡς γὰρ δωρεὰν εἰλήφε παρὰ Θεοῦ, δωρεὰν καὶ διακονεῖ. from Mat. x. 8. δωρεὰν ἐλάβετε, δωρεὰν δότε. Again; τὰ κρύφια εἰς φανερὸν ἀγόντων. from 1 Cor. xiv. 25. καὶ οὕτω τὰ κρυπτὰ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ φανερὰ γίνεται.

After Irenæus, there is hardly any mention made of the gift of tongues in ecclesiastical history. One who hath written the life of Pachomius, a monk of the fourth century, says, amongst other things equally marvellous and equally credible, that this saint had received a power to speak all sorts of languages. See Bollandus, or Tillemont, H. E. vii. p. 224.

As to the ejection of dæmons, mentioned by Irenæus and other fathers, every one knows how often even the wise and the wary have been deceived in the affair of sorcery, witchcraft, and dæmoniacal operations. The proofs must be very clear, and the case easily distinguishable from bodily disorders, or from imposture, before a man should give a full assent to the testimony either of antient or of modern Christians. The speaking of new languages, as we observed in the former volume, hath been supposed one of the marks of a possession. 'Hoc prodigii dæmon imitatione prosecutus est, si creditur Hieronymo in Vita Hilarionis:' *Videres de ore barbaro, et qui Francam tantum et Latinam noverat, Syra ad purum verba resonare.* Simile prodigium narratur a Gregorio Magno: *Ammonius mihi jam in monasterio positus narravit, quòd in ea mortalitate quæ Patrici Narsi*[d] *temporibus, hanc urbem vehementer afflixit, in domo prædicti Valeriani puer armentarius fuit, præcipuæ simplicitatis, et humilitatis. Cum vero ejusdem advocati domus eadem clade vastaretur, idem puer percussus est, et ad mortem usque deductus, qui subito sublatus a præsentibus rediit, sibique dominum vocari fecit: cui ait, Ego in cœlo fui.—ut vero scias quod me in cœlum fuisse verum fateor, ecce accepi illic, ut linguis omnium loquar. Numquid tibi incognitum fuit, Græcam me lin-*

[d] I suppose it should be 'Patricii Narsetis,' or 'Narsis.'

guam omnino non nosse, et tamen Græce loquor, ut cognoscas an verum sit quod me omnes linguas accepisse confiteor; cui tunc Græce dominus suus locutus est: atque ita ille in eadem lingua respondit, ut cuncti qui aderant mirarentur. In eadem quoque domo prædicti Narsi Spatarius Vulgar manebat, qui festine ad ægrum deductus, ei vulgarica lingua locutus est. Sed ita puer ille in Italia natus et nutritus, in eadem locutione respondit. Quæ si vera sunt, ut vera esse possunt, crediderim non miserum puerum tot linguis imbutum fuisse, at dæmonem, ut olim serpentis, sic et loquentis lingua, finxisse voces pronuncianti peregrinas. Quippe die tertio infelix ille puer, *manus ac brachia, lacertosque suos, dentibus laniavit, atque ita de corpore exivit.*' S. Basnage, Annal. i. p. 424.

These things may be true, as Basnage observes; but surely we want better vouchers than Jerom, and Ammonius the Monk. We might as well believe, upon the authority of Æsop and Phædrus, that the *Fox* and the *Cat* held a dialogue together in Greek or in Latin.

'The reason for which so many magicians were found amongst the Jews, though they were condemned by the law of God, was, that the Jews ascribed most diseases, those especially which disturb the understanding and dislocate the limbs, to the malice of dæmons, and imagined that such diseases could only be cured by sorcery and incantations. We find in the Gospel, that when our Saviour cured the diseased and the possessed, the Jews said that he wrought these miracles by the power and assistance of dæmons.' Vigneul-Marville[e], tom. i. p. 278.

'There are men of abilities, who respect the authority of the sacred books, and yet know not how to believe that the dæmoniacs mentioned in the Gospels were tormented by dæmons. They are inclined to think that their diseases were natural, but that the causes of them were not known.

[e] His true name was 'Dom Bonaventure D'Argonne,' and he was 'Prieur de la Chatreuse de Gaillon.' See Lettres de Bayle, p. 666. 708. 869. 'Vous avez raison,' says Bayle, 'de trouver bon le Melange de Vigneul-Marville,' &c.

This opinion gives me no offence[f]: the miracles of our Saviour, upon this supposition, were only so much the greater, since it is much more wonderful to command a disease, than to command a devil to depart instantly, and to be instantly obeyed: besides, our Lord was not sent to rectify the wrong notions which the Jews might entertain concerning these maladies.' Thus Beausobre, in his posthumous remarks on Mat. v. p. 14. whose sincere attachment to Christianity no man can fairly call in question.

In his notes on Mark v. he is of opinion, that the dæmoniac who brake his chains and fetters, must have been assisted by an evil spirit; and that of the dæmoniacs mentioned in the sacred books, some were really possessed, and others were only afflicted with epilepsies, &c.

'Theosebius, a Pagan philosopher, had a wife who was possessed with a dæmon. To deliver her, he at first had recourse to prayers and humble intreaties; but the dæmon, who was an *opiniâtre*, made a jest of all this. At last Theosebius conjured him *in the name of the God of the Hebrews, and called to witness the Beams of the Sun.* Then the dæmon quitted his lodging, protesting that he had a profound respect for all the gods in general, but most particularly for the God of the Hebrews. It is not a Christian who relates this story; it is the philosopher Damascius.' Apud Phot. Cod. 242. col. 1037. Beausobre Hist. de Man. ii. 67.

It would not be right to overlook Tertullian's dæmoniac. A woman, says he, went to the theatre, and came home possessed by a devil. The exorcist, who endeavoured to cast him out, asked him how he had the assurance to enter into a Christian. Why not? said the dæmon: I found her at my own house. De Spectac. 26.

It is most probable that the dæmoniacs described in the New Testament were really possessed. See vol. i. p. 199. When the devils went out of the dæmoniacs, and entered into the swine, if the disorder of these men were only mad-

[f] Some learned men now living have declared themselves of this opinion, with a very good design, as I firmly believe; but their system is liable to insuperable objections.

ness, the sense must be, that *the disease left the men, and was transferred to the beasts*; and this must have been performed by the immediate act and power of Christ; but if it were a dæmoniacal case, the destruction of the beasts was only by his permission, and by the act and power of the evil spirits. It deserves therefore to be considered, whether a bare permission of our Lord, in this case, be not more consistent with the general character of his mighty works, which were of the merciful, and not of the severe kind, and also with the words of the three evangelists, which represent him, not as 'acting,' but only as 'not hindering.'

As to the dæmoniacs in the following ages, it may be left as a dubious point: dubious, I say; for it is possible that, after the apostolical age, evil spirits might be permitted or commanded by the Supreme Governor, to afflict men, and might be obliged to depart at the command of Christians, and at the name of Jesus. It is possible that such interpositions of dæmons might be permitted in one century and in one region, and not in another. The invisible, and spiritual, and angelical world may undergo many variations, and be subject to different restraints and regulations in different ages, so as to interfere more, or less, or not at all, in human affairs. Thus much in behalf, not of 'belief,' but of 'academical hesitation.'

Le Clerc, in his Historia Ecclesiastica, hath inserted the 'Christian Creed' as it stood in the days of Irenæus:

'Ecclesia, *inquit Irenæus*, tametsi per totum orbem, usque ad extremos terræ fines, sparsa, ab apostolis eorumque discipulis fidem accepit, quæ est, 1. in unum Deum Patrem Omnipotentem, qui fecit cœlum et terram et mare et omnia quæ in eis sunt, 2. et in unum Jesum Christum, Filium Dei, nostræ salutis caussâ, incarnatum; 3. et in Spiritum Sanctum, qui, per prophetas, œconomias et adventus (Christi) prædicavit, et generationem e Virgine, et perpessionem et resurrectionem e mortuis, et cum carne in cœlos adsumptionem dilecti Jesu Christi Domini nostri, et e cœlo adventum ejus, in gloriâ Patris, ad colligenda omnia, et ad excitandam omnem totius humani generis carnem; 4. ut Christo Jesu Domino nostro et Servatori et

Regi, secundum Patris inconspicui voluntatem, flectatur omne genu cœlestium, terrestrium, et inferorum, et omnis lingua ei confiteatur, utque ipse justum judicium in omnibus ferat, spiritualia quidem nequitiæ et angelos transgressores, quique in defectione fuerunt, impiosque item homines et injustos et flagitiosos et blasphemos in ignem æternum mittat: justis vero et sanctis, qui præcepta ejus servaverint, et in amore permanserint, seu ab initio, seu post pœnitentiam, vitam gratificatus, immortalitate eos donet, et gloriâ æternâ circumdet.'

'Hanc confirmat in sequentibus Irenæus fidem per totum terrarum orbem a Christianis unanimi consensu et una voce doceri.—Hinc intelligere est eadem esse omnibus summa fidei capita, nec doctos pluribus indigere ad consequendam salutem, quam minus eruditos, neque ad plura admittenda adigi posse. Revelationi, nimirum, ut detrahi nihil potest, sic nec quidquam addere fas est. Ideoque semel constituta fidei capita neque augeri, sine nova revelatione, neque minui possunt. Quod ad animum revocasse oportuisset eos, qui nova fidei capita sequentibus sæculis, sine novis ullis a Deo mandatis acceptis, condiderunt.—Ex hac, aliisve id genus priscis confessionibus, conflatum postea est, quod vocatur symbolum apostolorum, ut viri docti ostenderunt.' p. 651.

Let us add to this, the creed which is delivered to us by Tertullian:

'Unicum quidem Deum credimus, sub hac tamen dispositione, quam œconomiam dicimus, ut unici Dei sit et Filius, Sermo ipsius, qui ex ipso processerit, per quem omnia facta sunt, et sine quo factum est nihil; hunc missum a Patre in Virginem, et ex ea natum hominem et Deum, filium hominis et filium Dei, et cognominatum Jesum Christum; hunc passum, hunc mortuum et sepultum, secundum Scripturas, et resuscitatum a Patre, et in cœlos resumtum sedere ad dexteram Patris, venturum judicare vivos et mortuos; qui exinde miserit, secundum promissionem suam, a Patre Spiritum Sanctum Paracletum, sanctificatorem fidei eorum qui credunt in Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum.' Adv. Praxeam, 2.

These are perhaps the two most antient creeds that are extant, and not at all the worse for their antiquity.

TOWARDS the end of the second century, Pantænus, philosopher and a learned man, went to India to preach the gospel. He is not said to have wrought any miracles there; but it is related that he found Christians in those countries. Eusebius v. 10.

NARCISSUS was made bishop of Jerusalem about A. D. 180. The Christians of that country, in the time of Eusebius, preserved the memory of some wonderful works wrought by him, and in his favour, which Eusebius relates, vi. 9, 10, 11. It may seem the more probable that he should have been enabled to perform miracles, because he is not only represented as a very good man, but he was in some manner a disciple or successor of the apostles, and an apostolical father; for he was born about A. D. 96. before the death of St. John, was made bishop when he was eighty-four years old, and lived to an uncommon age, to a hundred and sixteen at least. But as his miracles stand upon traditionary report in Eusebius, every one may judge of them as he thinks fit.

Narcissus is said to have turned water into oil; but the change of water into oil, to supply the church lamps, has the air of a miracle performed upon an occasion rather too slender. Let us therefore leave it 'in ambiguo.'

This miracle calls to mind a story related by Dio xlviii. Orosius vi. and Eusebius in his Chronicon, that in the time of Augustus, a fountain of oil burst out at Rome, and flowed for a whole day. In natural history there are accounts of greasy and bituminous springs, where something like oil has floated on the water. Pliny xxxi. p. 549. and Harduin, in his Notes, mention many such fountains, 'qui explent olei vicem,' and, 'quorum aqua lucernæ ardeant.' So that this report of Dio, &c. should not rashly be ranked with 'the appearance of Castor and Pollux,' the 'man with the red beard,' and other prodigies of the like nature.

AN anonymous writer of the second century says, that Natalis, a confessor, having accepted of a bishoprick amongst the heretics, was severely scourged all night by angels, and the next morning repented and returned to the church.

Apud Euseb. v. 28. The testimony of this unknown writer cannot be of great authority; but the story seems to have given the hint to Jerom, to feign that he also underwent the same discipline for studying profane authors, Cicero, Virgil, &c. Upon which one of the Italian 'Ciceronians' hath observed, that if Jerom was whipped for being 'a Ciceronian,' that is, for writing altogether in the style and manner of Cicero, he suffered what he did not deserve[a], and might have pleaded 'Not guilty.'

Of all the Latin fathers, Lactantius would have been entitled to the most stripes, as being by far the purest and politest writer: but he escaped this punishment: he was not 'whipped;' he was only 'starved.' 'Lactantius, vir omnium suo tempore eruditissimus, sed adeo pauper, ut plerumque etiam necessariis indiguerit.' Hieronymus Chron. I mention not this as any thing extraordinary or wonderful; not as one of the miracles of the fourth century: for 'poverty' is a disease which rages as much and as frequently in the 'Republic of Letters,' as the 'plague' in 'Constantinople.' The 'motto' of the republic was given to it by Terence—it is:

'Modo liceat vivere; est spes. Quæ? Nos esurituros satis.'

From the death of Severus, A. D. 211, to Decius, A. D. 249, the Christians enjoyed a calm with little interruption; but prosperity is often a greater trial than adversity: a relaxation of discipline, and a corruption of manners ensued. Cyprian, De Lapsis, complains of it heavily, and describes it in very strong terms, which yet may perhaps require some abatement, though other writers concur in a great measure with him. His vehement temper, his indignation against vice, and his African eloquence, might induce him to make free with a figure called 'Exaggeration.' But the number of Christians who fell from the faith in the Decian persecution shows that there had been a preceding degeneracy. As the Christians and the Pagans had dwelt quietly together in civil society, they learned something of each other, and

[a] Yet he was a very good writer, for the time in which he lived.

the former grew too compliant to worldly fashions, and suffered from the contagion of bad example. In the time of Tertullian, if not before, there were some Christian soldiers; and it is hard to conceive how they could maintain their innocence in that station, and avoid such dissimulation, and such practices [b], as were scarcely allowable. It is to be supposed that the Christians kept out of the army as much as they could; which they might the more easily do, because the Roman service was attended with many profits, advantages, and privileges; and so the army was supplied and recruited with the less difficulty, and the officers were usually cautious in accepting those who offered themselves, and required testimonials of their being duly and legally qualified; but to be sure it must have happened sometimes that Christians were not left to their option, that a refusal would have been criminal, and that they must have listed, or have offended against the civil laws. In such cases they might think it permitted to them to enter into the service, though hardly as volunteers: but in this point, from the time of Tertullian, they grew less and less scrupulous.

Eusebius highly commends the behaviour of the Christian soldiers, who in the reign of Diocletian suffered themselves to be turned out, rather than renounce their religion, and at the same time represents their station as very honourable and very profitable, and producing τιμὴν, δόξαν, εὐπραγίαν. viii. 4. Martin was ordered by his father, who had served in the army, to list himself (as the laws required) about A. D. 356. 'cum edictum esset a regibus ut veteranorum filii ad militiam scriberentur.' Sulpit. Sever. Vit. Mart. c. 2. The army was chiefly composed of citizens, who had some fortunes, more or less, and whose names were in the public registers; nor did the Romans usually admit aliens, or beggars, or bankrupts, or slaves, or freed-men, into the land service, though in choosing marines they were not nice and scrupulous. They who refused to serve, when they were summoned, unless they had an exemption or a lawful excuse, were severely punished. But the stipends, the re-

[b] 'Religio tota castrensis signa veneratur, signa jurat, signa omnibus Diis præponit.' Tertullian. Apol. Afterwards the Christian soldiers worshipped their 'Labarum.'

wards, the privileges, the promotions, and the military genius of the Romans, made it easy enough to find soldiers. See Lipsius de Milit. Rom. and particularly the Theod. Code, l. vii. p. 251, &c.

TOWARDS the middle of the third century, one Paul fled from the persecution, for which he deserves to be commended; and, quitting all that he had, retired to the deserts, and, contracting a love of solitude and a dislike of the world, lived there alone, as it is said, ninety years. This hermit unfortunately set an example, which was followed by too many, and he may be considered as a kind of father and founder of the monks. Jerom wrote his life—his romance I should say, as also that of Hilarion, who became a monk in the beginning of the fourth century, when Antony was propagating monkery in Ægypt, and gathering disciples.

Tillemont hath made two extraordinary concessions concerning Jerom, that he was more disposed to augment than to diminish miracles, and that exactness was no part of his character. H. E. vii. p. 669. not. And Du Pin observes that Jerom's Life of Paul contains things 'qui sont fort peu croiables.'

ABOUT the same time began the schism of the Novatians, which lasted two hundred years, and then dwindled away. Their distinguishing character was, that they would not receive into the church penitent sinners, and those who lapsed in time of persecution. They are also said to have condemned second marriages. There were at the end of the sixth century, some people in Alexandria, called Novatians, who refused to honour the reliques of the martyrs, and therefore were accused of despising the saints, and of making a jest of martyrdom, according to the stupid jargon of the times. Tillemont H. E. iii. p. 475.

ORIGEN was born A. D. 185, and died about 253. He was very learned and ingenious, and indefatigably industrious; his whole life, from his early years, was spent in examining, teaching, and explaining the Scriptures, to which he joined the study of philosophy, and of all polite litera-

ture. He was humble, modest, and patient under great injuries and cruel treatment, which he received from Christians and Pagans; for though he ever had a considerable number of friends and admirers, on account of his amiable qualities and useful accomplishments, he was persecuted and calumniated by men who had neither his learning nor his virtue, degraded from the order of presbyters, driven from his home, and excommunicated by one Demetrius, bishop of Alexandria, who envied him, says Eusebius, for the reputation which he had gained. Whilst they were both together in the land of the living, the bishop had the advantage over the presbyter, so as to be able to harass and oppress him: but now *Origen* is a far more illustrious and a far more reverend name than *Demetrius*, in the Christian world, and in the republic of letters. 'Suum cuique decus rependit posteritas.'

'Pro hoc sudore quid accepit præmii Origenes? Damnatur a Demetrio episcopo. Exceptis Palæstinæ et Arabiæ et Phœnices atque Achaiæ sacerdotibus, in damnationem ejus consentit orbis. Roma ipsa contra hunc cogit senatum; non propter dogmatum novitatem, nec propter hæresim, ut nunc adversus eum rabidi canes simulant: sed quia gloriam eloquentiæ ejus et scientiæ ferre non poterant, et illo docente omnes muti putabantur.' So said Jerom, whilst he had a favourable opinion of Origen, and before he turned his coat and abused him. Vid. Rufin. Apol. ii.

'There are many,' says Origen, 'who, loving me more than I deserve, speak too advantageously of me, and ascribe to me what I have not, and pretend not to have: others decry all that I say and do, and accuse me of sentiments which I never held. Both transgress the rules of truth; the latter through spite and hatred, the former through fond affection, affection which perhaps deludes and misleads as much as enmity.' In Luc. Hom. 25.

By boldly and openly confessing Jesus Christ at all times, by attending the martyrs, and by converting many, and some of them considerable persons, to Christianity, he highly provoked the Pagans, and was often in the utmost danger; and in the reign of Decius he underwent imprisonment, chains, and tortures. When he was not seventeen years

old, his father suffered martyrdom: and he had so earnest a desire to die with him for the same cause, and threw himself so much in the way of the persecutors, that his mother was obliged to use violence, and to confine him at home. He then wrote his father a letter, exhorting him to be constant, and not moved by compassion and affection for his family, which consisted of a wife and seven sons who had nothing to support them, and would be left in great want. He was ever extremely sober and exemplary, practising what he preached to others; and he lived and died poor, and destitute even of common conveniences.

He carried his rigour and self-denial to an excess, using austerities which proved prejudicial to his constitution; and whilst he expounded the scriptures too much in the allegorical way [c], he interpreted, I know not how, some passages too *literally*, and by acting suitably to such a sense, he injured his own body and his health; but this was in his younger days, and he condemned himself for it afterwards.

His inquisitive genius, and his mixing philosophy with Christianity, led him perhaps into some learned singularities and ingenious rêveries; but he was by temper far from dogmatizing in such points, from fomenting schisms, and setting up himself for the head of a party. He lived in times when Christians were not so shackled with systems and determinations as they were afterwards, nor so much exposed to disingenuous and illiberal objections, and had more liberty to pursue their inquiries, and to speak their mind.

That he sacrificed to idols, to avoid an obscene and most infamous punishment contrived by the Pagans, is a tale recorded by the father of tales, by Epiphanius, who was a diligent collector of groundless and censorious reports, and who hated Origen and his writings. Towards the end of his life he wrote his justly esteemed book against Celsus, where, after owning that the number of miracles in his days was very much diminished, he speaks of some which

[c] His excesses of this kind can never be excused; they were in him even a distemper, which might be called 'Furor Allegoricus.'

were performed even then, as healing the sick, and casting out devils by invocation of Jesus; and he mentions some who were converted to Christianity by visions and revelations. He speaks of some of these things as one who was well informed, and he appeals to God that what he says is true, p. 34, 35, &c. This seems to be the best testimony we have, that the sick in those days were sometimes miraculously healed; and thus much may be affirmed, that he was utterly incapable of affirming a fact which he knew or suspected to be false.

But from his writings and from his conduct, it appears too evidently to be denied or dissembled, that, with all his great and good qualities, he had a warm imagination, which lessens the force of his testimony in the affair of miracles, though his piety and probity be unquestionable. He seems to have admitted the power of magical spells [d], and the efficacy of divine names pronounced in barbarous languages; and hence he also was accused of approving magic arts, by some of his adversaries, but unreasonably, since they ought rather to have charged him with over-credulity in these things.

'Origen figured to himself divers kinds of dæmons, presiding, if we may so say, over different vices, and having each their prince and their chief. Legions of dæmons, some of pride, others of anger, others of avarice or of fornication, laboured incessantly, under the orders of their leaders, to seduce miserable mortals, and to turn their hearts towards vice. This imagination was not peculiar to Origen.' Orig. in Jos. Hom. xv. Ap. Mass. Diss. in Iren. p. 62. Beausobre Hist. de Man. ii. 20.

It is no wonder if they who supposed that each vice had its presiding and influencing dæmon, found dæmons and dæmoniacs every where, and ascribed almost every moral or natural evil to evil spirits; so that a profligate fellow could not commit any misdemeanour, but it was 'Siquis, instigante diabolo,' &c.

But what Origen hath delivered concerning 'divine impulses' upon hearts properly disposed to receive them, is

[d] Contra Cels. i. 19. Synesius, a Platonic philosopher and a bishop, had much the same notions.

more probable and more reasonable. 'Many,' says he, 'have been brought over to Christianity, by the Spirit of God giving a sudden turn to their minds, and offering visions to them either by day or by night; so that instead of hating the word, they became ready even to lay down their lives for it. I have seen many examples of this sort.—God is my witness, that my sole purpose is to recommend the religion of Jesus, not by fictitious tales,' &c. Why should it be thought improbable that Pagans of good dispositions, but not free from prejudices, should have been called by divine admonitions, by dreams, or visions, which might be a support and a reinforcement to Christianity in those days of distress? See the story of Basilides and Potamiæna, in Eusebius, vi. 5. Basilides, whilst he was a Pagan soldier, had showed great humanity and compassion to this illustrious virgin and martyr, and she prayed to God for his conversion, and, as we are told, appeared to him in a dream; upon which he professed himself a Christian, and was beheaded. Potamiæna[a] seems to have been one of Origen's disciples; and it is not at all unlikely (though I think it hath hitherto escaped observation) that Origen had this example in his thoughts, when he wrote the words above cited.

Socrates the historian makes a remark in which Plato and Origen are concerned. Speaking of two learned presbyters, he expresses his wonder that they continued Arians, 'since one of them was very fond of Plato, and the other of Origen;' ὧν ὁ μὲν τὸν Πλάτωνα ἀεὶ μετὰ χεῖρας εἶχεν· ὁ δὲ Ὠριγένην ἀνέπνεεν. vii. 6. Οὐδὲ γὰρ Πλάτων, says he, τὸ δεύτερον καὶ τὸ τρίτον αἴτιον, ὡς αὐτὸς ὀνομάζειν ἔιωθεν, ἀρχὴν ὑπάρξεως εἰληφέναι φησί· καὶ Ὠριγένης συναΐδιον παντοκρατορι τὸν υἱὸν τῷ Πατρί. 'Etenim nec Plato secundam ac tertiam Causam, ut ipse quidem nominare solet, existendi initium cepisse dicit: et Origenes passim in libris suis Filium Patri coæternum esse confitetur.' He adds that these

[a] Rufinus Potamiænam Origenis discipulam facit. In quo Rufino refragari equidem non ausim. Etsi enim id diserte non dixit Eusebius, ex ejus tamen narratione id colligi videtur. Nam cum martyres qui ex Origenis schola extiterunt, hic recensens, Basilidem et Potamiænam illis accenseat, hi quoque ex Origenis discipulis fuerint necesse est; quod cum de Basilide dici non possit, de Potamiæna certe fit admodum probabile. Valesius.

two eloquent and learned ecclesiastics, though they continued in their own church, mended and improved the Arians not a little, and brought them nearer to the Consubstantialists. Both sides wanted mending very much, and to be taught to differ and dispute at least like Christians, and not to pull out one another's eyes.

The Arians and the [b] Consubstantialists both laid claim to Origen, as favouring their systems, and neither side wanted arguments drawn from his writings; for, on the one hand, Origen admitted the eternity of the Λόγος; and, on the other hand, he said many things concerning the Λόγος, which seemed agreeable to the Semi-Arian doctrines.

Origen was a Platonic Christian, and a Platonist would have readily allowed that the Λόγος was an eternal emanation or production from the 'First Cause,' the Τὸ Ἕν.

Cudworth hath made it probable that some notion of a Trinity obtained in the Pagan world. It is to be found even amongst the Chinese, if the accounts given us of that nation may be credited. Whence had the Pagans this notion? From 'the first chapter of Genesis,' say some persons. Let them by all means enjoy their opinion, if they can refrain from anathematizing those who differ from them, and not imitate the sage council of Sirmium, which anathematized all those who should dare to deny that God the Father spake to his Son, when he said, 'Let us make man,' &c. Socrates H. E. ii. 80.

The Platonic philosophers, when they considered the visible, and vital, and intellectual system, found that, besides sluggish and inanimate matter, which has a shadowy being, and is a small remove above nothing, there existed in the universe, 'life and active power;' above that, 'reason, understanding, wisdom;' above that, 'goodness,' above which there could be no imaginable perfection. The same things they found in every man who acts according to his nature, namely, 'life, reason, and goodness.' Tracing effects up to their causes, and proceeding in the ascending scale, above all other beings, they placed as Principles, a Ψυχή, above that a Λόγος, and above both a Τὸ Ἕν καὶ

[b] One part of them, I mean; for others condemned him as a father of Arianism.

Ἀγαθόν. These notions the Platonics ascribed to their Master; but it must be confessed that Plato talks 'very obscurely' upon the subject.

The emperor Julian, who rejected Christ, did not reject the notion of a Λόγος. His Λόγος was 'the Sun,' whom he accounted to be the visible image of the invisible God, whilst he perversely shut his eyes against the 'Sun of righteousness' that arose on a benighted world with salvation in his rays.

Erasmus was one of those who had a high esteem for Origen. 'Plus me docet,' says he, 'Christianæ philosophiæ unica Origenis pagina, quam decem Augustini.' This is an honourable testimony for Origen; it is 'laudari a viro laudato.'

GREGORY, called Thaumaturgus, a disciple of Origen, is said to have wrought many miracles; but Eusebius, who makes honourable mention of him, says not a word concerning them; which is remarkable: and some of them are of a very suspicious kind, as his writing Laconic epistles to Satan, and laying commands upon him, which were punctually obeyed. This is full as probable as that the bones of Babylas drove the devil from Daphne; though both these ingenious stories, with others of the same kind, are defended by Tillemont, and by Father Baltus, and the latter by Cave, and by many other writers. The relators of Gregory's miracles lived when romancing was much in fashion, as Socrates, Theodoret, Rufinus; and also Gregory of Nyssa who wrote his life, and this Gregory's brother Basil, who had learned many of these stories from their grand-mother Macrina. Gregory Nyssen says also that the apostle St. John, at the request of the Virgin Mary, presented Thaumaturgus with a [b] Creed, which the Saint wrote down immediately, and ever after made use of, as well he might, and transmitted it to posterity. The story seems to have been borrowed from the transactions between Numa and the goddess Egeria; and both are equally credible. This διοπετὲς ἄγαλμα, 'this symbol dropt from the clouds,'

[b] See Waterland's Importance, &c. p. 232. Berriman's 'Hist. Acc. of the Trin. Contr.' p. 138. 141. Middleton's Inquiry, p. 148.

which must needs be a wonderful curiosity, is still extant, to our great benefit, and may be seen, though it cannot be warranted free from interpolations, in Fabricius, Bibl. Græc. v. p. 249. or in Cave's Life of Gregory. Here arises no small difficulty, the solution of which shall be left to those whom it concerns: If the Christians of the fourth and following centuries were satisfied with the truth of this narration, they should certainly have drawn up no new Creeds, but have rested contented with a truly 'Apostolical Symbol,' and not have had the vanity to think that they could compose a better than St. John's.

Many of these [c] celestial gifts were bestowed in better days upon mortal men. Pachomius, a monk of the fourth century, received from an angel a table of brass, containing rules for the monastic order. The fact is related by Cyril of Alexandria, by Palladius Lausiac. 38. by Sozomen iii. 14. and by Gennadius Vit. Patr. 'Be it as it will,' says Du Pin; 'for although this story be reported by many authors, I cannot think that we are absolutely obliged to believe it.' Saint Pacome.

In the eighth century some monks pretended that the angel Gabriel had brought *twelve* articles from heaven, one of which was that ecclesiastics must not marry. A *thirteenth* should have been added, 'that they might keep concubines.' Bibl. Univers. xii. p. 376.

In the twelfth century an angel brought from heaven a book of prophecies upon copper plates, and gave it to a priest called Cyril, who gave it to abbot Joachim. Bibl. Univ. xi. p. 13.

In Fabricius there is an epistle of Jesus Christ which was said to fall from heaven. Cod. Apocr. N. T. p. 307. But this is an imposture too profane to be laughed at.

Not only the antient Pagan legislators, but the heretics also had the start of the Catholics in this curious device. An obscure sect of men called Helcesaitæ, βίβλον τινὰ φέρουσιν, ἣν λέγουσιν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καταπεπτωκέναι, 'produce a book, which they affirm to have fallen from heaven,' says Origen apud Euseb. vi. 38.

[c] See more of these Christian frauds in Beausobre, Hist. de Manich. i. p. 388.

It is affirmed, and there is no reason to reject it, that when Gregory was made bishop, Neocæsarea and its neighbourhood consisted almost entirely of Pagans, and that when he died he left it as full of Christians, whom he had converted, and who retained a great and lasting respect for his memory, which was honoured, says Socrates, in Athens, Berytus, Pontus, and indeed in all the earth.

In the third century began the Manichæan heresy, of which I shall give an account extracted from Beausobre, who has fully discussed the subject in his History of Manichæism, and cleared it from abundance of lies and forgeries.

The Manichæans fell into great errors, and strangely corrupted the Christian faith; but they were much misrepresented, and cruelly treated by their adversaries, which probably was the case of many other antient heretics.

The Christians of every sect and denomination, the eastern Pagans, the Mahometans, and the Jews, have all agreed in hating the Manichæans.

Their books are lost; for it was an old custom with the Christians to burn heretical writings, and to forbid the reading of them.

The accounts therefore which we have of antient heretics are usually very imperfect, and not to be depended upon; for the orthodox, either through resentment or ignorance, have not done them justice.

Manichæus pretended to be an apostle of Jesus Christ, and a prophet illuminated by the Paraclete, to reform all religions, and to reveal those truths which our Saviour thought it not proper to commit to his first disciples. This was his imposture, or his fanaticism; for he pretended not himself to be the Holy Ghost, though he has been accused of it.

By virtue of this divine mission, he rejected the Old and reformed the New Testament. He pretended either that the Gospels were not the work of apostles or apostolical men whose names they bare, or that if they were, they had been falsified by Judaizing Christians: but it appears not that he or his followers took upon them to curtail or interpolate the New Testament.

Having denied the inspiration, or at least the superior authority of the Hebrew prophets, he opposed to them other prophets, whose books the eastern nations pretended to have preserved. He affirmed that every nation had been favoured with prophets, and that the Christian church, being chiefly composed of Gentiles, ought to be guided by those illuminated Gentile teachers, and not by Hebrew instructors.

He admitted the authority of apocryphal books composed to maintain the heresies of the Docetæ and of the Encratites, whose notions he also adopted, those of the former, who held that Christ had only the appearance of a man, and those of the latter, who condemned marriage and the use of animal food.

Manichæus believed that the divine nature was extended and limited: but as he limited not the divine perfections, his error was the less noxious, nor were some of the fathers free from it.

He held a Trinity, and the consubstantiality of the Persons, but he thought them as really distinct as three men. We must not hence charge him with Tritheism, unless we would involve in the same charge many of the most illustrious fathers, who were in the same sentiment.

He acknowledged only one God, to whom he ascribed all the attributes that seemed to him to belong to a Being supremely perfect. Having no idea of a substance without place and extension, he conceived the Divinity to be a living immaterial *Light*, which had resided from all eternity in the highest heaven, accompanied with pure and immortal spirits, whom he called Æons, and who were emanations of the divine essence. This was a Platonic notion. Yet were these Æons infinitely beneath their Author, and not, properly speaking, Gods.

The highest heaven and the intelligent agents who inhabit it, compose the intellectual world, which is eternal. The luminous substance, of which heaven is formed, is coeternal with God; it is also self-existent, since from nothing nothing can proceed: but the heaven and the Æons have only a secondary eternity, since they have a cause, which is God; yet as this cause hath operated from all

eternity, they are likewise eternal. This also was Platonic.

From the essence of the Father have emaned two persons, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. These two emanations are far superior to all the others: they are consubstantial with the Father, but subordinate, and they have not absolute independency, which belongs to him alone. The first of these, since the formation of the material world, resides in the sun and moon, the second in the air. There they execute the orders of the Father, and there they will remain till the consummation of the age. In this part of the Manichæan system there are notions not remote from the Hebrew and the Ægyptian theology.

In a corner of infinite space resided from all eternity an evil power, which Manichæus called *matter* in philosophic style, the *devil* in vulgar style, and *darkness* in mystical language, which was that of the *magi*. The empire of this power was divided into five regions, the uppermost of which surrounded and contained within it the rest. Each of these regions had one of the elements of matter, together with living animals formed out of it; each had also its ruling prince, but all were under the dominion of the Great Prince, the sole head of the evil powers.

These two empires being thus divided by I know not what bounds, God knew the *darkness*, but the *darkness* knew not him, or the *light*, nor would ever have known the happy realms, if a sedition which arose in it had not caused the powers of darkness to come forth from their limits. Seeing the light, they projected to make an irruption into that kingdom, and to seize it. God opposed to them a power called 'the first man,' who was armed with the five elements of the celestial substance. Among these elements was that of light, by which was probably meant the human soul. But this first man being too weak for his adversaries, God sent to his aid a second power, called 'the living Spirit,' who delivered him. However, the dæmons having seized a part of the heavenly substance, light and darkness became blended together. This fable was intended as a solution of the origin of natural and moral evil.

The living spirit having conquered the dæmons, chained them in the air, leaving them no more liberty than he judged suitable to his own designs. There, in their fury, they are the cause of tempests, thunder, lightning, rain, and contagious distempers.

The two substances being mixed, the living spirit judged that he could make something grand and beautiful out of them; and indeed this was the intention of the supreme God in permitting this mixture. The spirit began then by separating the parts of the celestial substance which were preserved from the contagion of matter, and of them he formed the sun and moon: of those which were corrupted only in a small degree he made the planets, and the lower heaven. The rest remained confounded with the material substance, and it was all employed in forming our sublunary world, where good and evil are intermixed.

As human souls were the most excellent parts of the celestial substance which the princes of darkness had seized, they contrived to retain them. The Great Prince formed two organized bodies upon the model of the 'first man,' whom he had beheld. He made them of different sexes, and in them he inclosed the first souls which he had taken. His project was to charm them by the sweet impressions of the senses, to make them love their prisons, and to incline them irresistibly to perpetuate their captivity, by the allurements of concupiscence: and as generation continues to produce bodies resembling the two first, the souls which flutter in the air, and are dispersed every where in these lower regions, imprudently enter into the corporeal prisons which concupiscence continually produces and prepares for their reception; there they willingly continue, enamoured with their habitation.

Souls, being of celestial origin, have by nature the seeds of virtue, and the knowledge of duty; but when they are united to bodies, they drink in the cup of oblivion a pernicious poison, which deprives them of their memory. That was Platonic.

To remedy this inconvenience, the Divine Providence at first made use of the ministry of good angels, who taught the antient patriarchs salutary truths. These transmitted the knowledge of them to their descendants; and that this

light might never be totally extinguished, God hath not ceased to raise up in all times, and in all nations, wise men and prophets, till at last it pleased him to send his Son into the world. This divine minister instructed human souls concerning their true origin, the causes of their captivity, and the means of their deliverance. After having wrought innumerable miracles to confirm his doctrine, he taught them, by his mystical crucifixion, how they ought to mortify the flesh with its affections: he also showed them by his mystical resurrection and ascension, that death destroys not the man, but only breaks his prison, and restores to purified souls the liberty of returning to their heavenly country.

Flesh being composed of matter, and of the most vicious part of matter, it followed thence that the Son of God could only take the figure, not the real nature of man. Therefore Manichæus denied the incarnation, and the birth of Christ from a virgin. He denied also that Christ made use of food for his sustenance, that he had a soul susceptible of the innocent affections, that he suffered, died, and rose again. He acknowledged that all this was done in appearance, but not in reality. He denied also the resurrection of the flesh, since that would be a perpetuating of those evils of which the flesh is the cause. He *disapproved* of marriage, as being the invention of the devils, to tie the souls to the flesh, and to retard their return to heaven. He strongly recommended all the austerities which serve to mortify the body; and for the same reason he *disapproved* of the use of wine, and of flesh, pretending that it nourished the body too much, and inflamed concupiscence. He required of his 'elect,' or the 'perfect,' that they should embrace a voluntary poverty, and meddle with no secular affairs.

This heresiarch knew well, that as concupiscence hath such an empire over the mind, it would be a vain thing absolutely to prohibit marriage: he therefore permitted or tolerated it in the laity, as also meat, wine, and the possession of worldly goods. As all could not aspire to evangelical perfection, he used some condescension towards the weak: but as to the perfect, and particularly the ecclesiastics, he ordered them to imitate the life of Christ, who never was married,

and who had no possessions. He permitted them only the most spiritualized pleasures, such as music and perfumes. His design was to wean the soul from sensual affections, because, unless it be perfectly purified, it is not qualified for the heavenly mansions.

As it is not possible that all human souls should acquire this perfection in the present state, he admitted the transmigration of the soul, a doctrine much received by those who held its immortality. He taught that souls passed from one body to another, but that those which were not purged in a certain number of these revolutions, were delivered to the dæmons of the air, to be tormented and tamed by them; that after this severe discipline they were sent into other bodies, as into a new school, till having acquired a sufficient degree of purity, they traverse the region of matter, and enter into the moon; that the moon, when she is full of these spirits, which is when her surface is entirely bright, transmits them to the sun, and he sends them to that place which the Manichæans called 'the Pillar of Glory.' Manichæus was not the inventor of these notions.

The Holy Ghost, who resides in the air, continually assists the souls by his salutary influences. The sun, who is composed of a pure and purifying fire, facilitates their ascent to heaven, and purges off the material particles, whose weight retards their flight.

When all the souls, and all the parts of the celestial substance shall be separated and disengaged from matter, then shall be the consummation of the age. A devouring fire shall burst forth from the caverns in which the Creator hath imprisoned it. The angel who holds up the earth, shall let it fall into the flames, and then cast the useless mass from the limits of the world, into the place called in Scripture 'Utter Darkness.' There shall the devils dwell for ever; and the souls, which by indolence have not finished their purification at the time of this great catastrophe, for the chastisement of their negligence, shall be appointed to guard the doors of the infernal regions, and to keep the devils confined to their prison, that they may no more make any attempts and inroads on the kingdom of God.

The punishments which God inflicts on human souls are corrective, and intended to produce reformation, and will produce this happy effect, more or less, sooner or later; but the souls which have been so corrupted as to be found in a state of imperfection at the last day, must be doomed to this situation and employment, which may be considered rather as a deprivation of superior happiness and glory, than as actual misery.

Such is the Manichæan system.

The difficulty of conceiving a creation, and of accounting for the origin of evil, and an unwillingness to ascribe it to God, gave rise to the doctrine of two Principles, one good, the other evil, or God and Matter, matter eternal and uncreated, and containing in itself the seeds of incorrigible evil, natural and moral, whence sprang evil beings, and their chief.

This notion was very antient, and held by Persians, Chaldæans, Indians, and other oriental nations, and thence brought into Christianity by Christian heretics.

Basilides seems to have been the first who introduced it into Christianity at the beginning of the second century.

Manichæus, or Manes, who was a Chaldæan or Babylonian, was born about A. D. 240. and was a learned and ingenious man, and a good astronomer and geographer. He taught that the earth was spherical, and this was one of his heresies. Eusebius was of the same opinion concerning the figure of the earth, but advances it cautiously, for fear of giving offence to the Christians of his time.

Manichæus was ordained in his youth a presbyter in the Christian church; but a desire of mixing his philosophical notions with Christianity, led him to make a new system out of both, which he hoped to propagate among the Persian infidels and the Christians. Upon this he was excommunicated, and then he insinuated himself into the favour of the Persian king.

But his personal success was small, and he pleased neither party. He offended the Persian Christians by his heresies, and he offended Sapor the Persian king, and the magi, by innovating and pretending to reform the Zoroas-

trian doctrines and ceremonies, and was forced to fly his country.

Hormizdas, son and successor of Sapor, favoured him; but a king who reigned afterwards is said to have put him to death; and his disciples were then persecuted in Persia.

His heresy died not with him; it spread itself in Persia, Mesopotamia, Syria, Ægypt, Greece, Afric, and Spain.

Most of the antient heresies were a mixture of philosophy, Greek, or Oriental, and of Christianity.

The most antient sects in Christianity, after the Judaizing Christians, were the Ebionites and the Docetæ; and they were directly opposite: the first denied the divinity, and the second the humanity of Jesus Christ. St. John seems to have had them both in view, asserting against the first, that 'the Word was God,' and against the second, that 'the Word was made flesh.'

Manes borrowed and adopted many notions of heretics who had appeared before him, of the Docetæ, and of Basilides, Marcion, Valentinus, Bardesanes.

It is not fair to charge those who held two principles, with admitting two Gods, which they constantly disclaimed. All the dualists in general held that there was only one God, and looked upon the evil principle as upon a dæmon unworthy of the name of God.

The Manichæans detested evil spirits, and never paid them any honour, nor did they invoke angels or saints; but they were constant and assiduous in prayer to God.

They imagined God to be extended and *corporeal*, but not *material*, and not present where the evil substance was, yet infinitely extended every where else.

They thought that matter was endued with sense and perception, but not with any morally good quality; and that from this matter the devil was formed, not from eternity, but in time.

They were not fatalists, or not more so than many Christians have been; they held a liberty in the soul to do well or ill, and also the doctrine of original sin, of divine assistance, and of the necessity of infant-baptism.

When they endeavoured to prove from the New Testa-

ment, that Jesus Christ was not born of the Virgin Mary, and had not a human body, they had recourse to miserable shuffle and chicanery, receiving the words of the sacred writers when they could wrest them to their own purpose, and rejecting them when they could not.

In their morals they seem to have been as good as most of their contemporaries, and by no means scandalous; yet in this point they met with cruel usage, and were charged with shocking impurities and abominations[a] in their religious ceremonies, and in celebrating the Lord's supper.

Augustin having reproached the Manichæans with being no other than Pagan schismatics, who had separated themselves from the body of the Gentiles, but had retained their superstitions and their idolatry, Faustus the Manichæan replies; 'The Pagans serve the deity by temples, images, altars, victims, perfumes. As for me, I serve him in another manner, and have quite another notion of the worship which is agreeable to him: It is I myself, if I be worthy of it, who am the reasonable temple of God. I receive in me Jesus Christ his Son, the living image of the Divine Majesty. A soul instructed in the truth is God's altar; and as to the honours and sacrifices due to him, I hold them to consist of pure and pious prayers. How then can I be a schismatical Pagan?'

In this description we may discern the worship of the Christian church, before it was altered by the mixture of numberless Pagan or Judaical ceremonies, and corrupted by secular pride. So that if Faustus be not an audacious liar, which there is no reason to think, there was nothing reprehensible in the Manichæan worship. Manichæus, who separated himself from the catholic church in the third century, retained the worship as he found it and transmitted it to his followers, whilst the catholics altered it every day by new superstitions.

This also is what Faustus fails not to retort upon Augustin, and to represent the catholics as schismatics, who

[a] Ἄνδρες γὰρ τὰ ἐν τοῖς ἐννυπνιασμοῖς ἐνθυμεῖσθωσαν, καὶ γυναῖκες τὰ ἐν ἀφέδροις. Cyril. Hier. Cat. vi. Such remarks are not fit to be inserted in a sermon or catechism.

having separated themselves from the Gentiles, had retained many of their errors and superstitions. 'You have substituted,' says he, 'your *Agapæ* to the sacrifices of the Pagans, and to their idols your martyrs, whom you serve with the very same honours. You appease the shades of the dead with wine and feasts; you celebrate the solemn festivals of the Gentiles, their calends, and their solstices; and as to their manners, those you have retained without any alteration. Nothing distinguishes you from the Pagans, except that you hold your assemblies apart from them.'

There is in these accusations some exaggeration and falsehood; but it must be confessed that there is also some truth, and that Paganism had already begun to enter, along with the Pagans, into the church. It increased greatly in process of time.

The Valdenses [b] and the Albigenses were persecuted and massacred, under the pretence of being Manichæans, A. D. 1022. which cruelty continued in Europe long afterwards against persons falsely accused of this heresy.

It has been for a long time a kind of merit to accuse, and even to calumniate heretics, and a crime to excuse them. Why should a man engage in their defence, unless he be engaged in their errors? This spirit and temper passed from the Jews to the Christians, and hath continued to this day: and so far is it carried, that to commend the learning, the eloquence, the abilities, the virtues of some illustrious sectary, is to be a favourer of heretics, and to tread the paths that lead to excommunication. The learned world is well acquainted with this ecclesiastical policy, and not ignorant of its reasons.

Upon a fair examination it will appear that no part of history hath been more falsified and misrepresented than that which relates to sects and heresies. The frantic extravagances, the strange impurities, the detestable abomi-

[b] Beausobre wrote a history of these persecuted Christians, and of the reformation in Germany, which, as I am informed, is in the hands of his relations. If they would offer proposals for printing it by subscription, it is to be hoped that all lovers of literature would join to recommend and encourage the undertaking. I can answer for one, though an inconsiderable person.

nations which have been imputed to many societies who invoked the holy name of Jesus Christ, appear to me as so many outrages done to Christianity; and I cannot read without indignation, those evidently fabulous stories of antient sects, charged with monstrous errors, and infamous ceremonies. All this is the effect of blind zeal, weak credulity, precipitation, and blunder. For what more specious argument against Christianity, than this multitude of sects, seeming to vie with one another which should have the honour to invent the most absurd opinions, and the most profane and ungodly rites? The Pagan philosophers failed not to make their advantage of it, and by it to expose Christianity to the contempt and hatred of the people. It is true that the philosophers who passed over from Judaism and Paganism to Christianity corrupted the simplicity of the Gospel, and turned it into a contentious religion, and filled it with unedifying speculations: but as to impure and abominable mysteries, either they who practised them were not Christians, but true Pagans, or those pretended mysteries were fable and fiction.

The Christians accused Manes of being a magician upon very slender grounds. If he had done what Saint Macarius did, there would have been more reason for the suspicion. Palladius, in his history of this monk, tells us, that having interrogated a human skull, the skull answered him, and let him into all the mystery of the state of the dead. It must be confessed that this miracle hath a very magical air, and that, without the best attestations in the world of being a sound catholic, whosoever should do as much in the territories of the Holy Inquisition, would run a great risque of being sent to see whether the skull had given a true account.

Fasting is a kind of austerity too much esteemed in the East, to have been neglected by the Manichæans. The Syrians in general, under which name I comprehend all the communions of the Levant, and the nations beyond Syria, are naturally very austere. Thence it came to pass that monkery, born and nursed in Ægypt, made a great and rapid progress amongst the Syrians: thence the stylitæ, so famous in those parts, whom some Heretics called 'holy birds,' and 'martyrs in the air.' The Easterns are

very sober, and in Persia, the sobriety of the Westerns would be accounted no better than intemperance. The Syrians are perhaps the greatest fasters in the universe. Of the three hundred and sixty-five days of the year, they have one hundred and sixty of fixed fasts, without counting the weekly fasts of Wednesday and Friday observed in all Eastern communions. I cannot forbear citing on this occasion, a passage from the moral system of the Guebres, or antient Persians. 'When others keep a fast, the meaning is, that they eat nothing before dinner: our fast consists in endeavouring to restrain the organs of our body, our hands, our eyes, our tongues, from all sin. It is better to abstain from concupiscence and vice, than from food.' This, indeed, is the fast recommended by the prophets, but it is the least brilliant, and the most difficult, and not at all calculated to please hypocrites.

THUS far from Beausobre; to which I add:

MANES drew up a theological system, and entered into a minute detail of things transacted before Adam, for which he had no proofs to give from Scripture or from reason, and therefore thought it convenient to pretend to inspiration. If a man had asked him, Where wast *thou*, when the *dæmons* brake prison, and fought with the *first man*, and with the *Living Spirit?* he must have replied, The Lord hath revealed these things to his servant Manes. To which the other might have said, Foretell us, then, future events, and work some miracles, that we may be satisfied of thy mission, and then it will be time enough to take thy marvellous doctrines into consideration.

It may seem strange that he had disciples; but it will seem so only to those who consider not what passes in the world. Manes was bold, ingenious, learned, and insinuating; but men, who resembled him in nothing besides effrontery, have found admirers and followers.

Jerom says, 'Nullus potest hæresin struere, nisi qui ardentis ingenii est, et habet dona naturæ, quæ a Deo artifice sunt creata.' It is usually as Jerom observes; but to this general rule there are exceptions. 'Multum refert

in quæ tempora cujusque virtus inciderit.' Sometimes the most frantic enthusiast, or the most absurd and unintelligible mortal, shall be the author of a doctrine or of a system, and shall beget sons and daughters after his own image and similitude. True it is, that such a sect seldom holds out for above half a century, or descends beyond the second generation; as amongst the brutes, a mule, whose sire is an ass, leaves no posterity, and is the last of the family.

The heresies which arose amongst Christians, admitted the truth of the Christian religion, and were a sort of Christianity, though sometimes so corrupted and adulterated as hardly to deserve that appellation. Mohammedism itself made some concessions to the Jews, and to the Christians; and if the author of it had denied the divine mission of Moses and of Christ, he would not have gathered five disciples. Christianity, on the contrary, entered into no composition with Paganism, but absolutely condemned the whole system of idolatry, and so had stronger prejudices to contend with, and yet was triumphant.

The Manichæans gave to each man two souls, the one a good, the other a bad one. Clemens Alexandrinus mentions an odd and ridiculous notion held by some heretics, that God made man down to the navel, and that the rest of him was made by another power. Ἐντεῦθεν ἄλλοι τινὲς κινηθέντες μικροὶ καὶ οὐτιδανοὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ὑπὸ διαφόρων δυνάμεων πλασθῆναι λέγουσι, καὶ τὰ μὲν μέχρις ὀμφαλοῦ θειοδεστέρας τέχνης εἶναι· τὰ ἔνερθε δὲ, τῆς ἥττονος· οὐ δὴ χάριν, ὀρέγεσθαι συνουσίας. 'Hinc moti aliqui alii, pusilli et nullius pretii, dicunt formatum fuisse hominem a diversis potestatibus: et quæ sunt quidem usque ad umbilicum, esse artis divinioris; quæ autem subter, minoris: qua de caussa coitum quoque appetere.' Strom. iii. p. 526.

Theodoret says, that the Eunomians, as well as the Marcionites, held that there were two principles, and that the lower parts of the human body came from the evil principle. He probably misrepresents the Eunomians, for what hath Arianism to do with Manichæism? Eunomius was an Arian indeed, and the father of an Arian sect; yet as far as we can judge from his writings, some of which are

still extant, and have escaped burning, he was no more a Manichæan than Epiphanius, or Athanasius, or Jerom, or Theodoret.

'Theodoritus L. iv. Hæreticarum fabularum cap. 3. inter alia Eunomianis tribuit, quod et ipsi cum Marcione duo rerum principia, malum et bonum, statuerint, et inferiores partes a malo principio ortas, et hinc non totum baptizandum esse hominem docuerint. Cui congruit quod S. Ambrosius Eunomianos jungit Marcionistis, L. i. de Officiis c. 2. ad quem locum conferendæ notæ Monachor.' Benedictin. tom. ii. p. 31. Fabricius Bibl. Gr. viii. 251.

'Eunomius ritus baptismi immutavit, qua de re accusatum fuisse fatetur Philostorgius. Testis potentissimus mutationis est Epiphanius: *Qui jam baptizati sunt, iterum baptizat Eunomius, non modo qui a Catholicis, aut ab aliis hæresibus, sed eos etiam qui ab ipsismet Arianis deficiunt. Repetiti porro illius baptismatis ea formula est,* "*In nomine Dei increati, et in nomine Filii creati, et in nomine Spiritûs sanctificantis, et a creato Filio procreati.*" Aliam tamen adhibuisse formulam in Theodorito legimus: *Dicit non oportere ter immergere eum qui baptizatur, nec Trinitatem invocare, sed semel baptizare in mortem Christi.* Risune an lacrimis prosequenda, quæ de Eunomiani baptismi ritibus a Veteribus sunt memoriæ mandata? Epiphanius: *Sunt qui narrent, quotquot ab iis denuo baptizantur in caput demergi, pedibus in sublime porrectis, et sic jusjurandum adigi, nunquam se ab illius hæresi discessuros.* Observat et Nicetas: *Longissimâ fasciâ, eum in usum paratâ consecratâque, hominem a pectore, usque ad extremos pedum articulos involvebant, tum deinde superiores corporis partes aqua proluebant.* Cujus ritus causa hæc fuit, quod inferioribus corporis partibus pollui aquam arbitrabantur. Tantum superstitio potuit suadere malorum! *Baptizatos ad pectus usque aqua madefaciunt,* inquit Theodoritus, *reliquis autem partibus corporis, tanquam abominandis, aquam adhibere prohibent.* Discipulis Eunomii ecclesias visitare moris non erat. *Omnes sectatores ejus Basilicas apostolorum et martyrum non ingrediuntur, ut scilicet mortuum adorent Eunomium, cujus libros majoris authoritatis arbitrantur quam evangelia.*

Hieronymus. Neque castiores doctrinâ mores fuere, si vera de Ætio prædicat Epiphanius: *Cum quidam ob stuprum feminæ illatum accusarentur, et ab aliis damnarentur, nihil illum commotum: sed factum risu et ludibrio prosequentem dixisse, Nullius hoc esse momenti: corporis enim hanc esse necessitatem.*' S. Basnage Ann. ii. 861.

Observe that the testimonies of Epiphanius and of Theodoret, concerning the form of Eunomian baptism, contradict each other. We may suppose that the Eunomians used only one *immersion*, or rather *superinfusion*, and that they baptized in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as they were plainly directed to do by the Scriptures, to which they paid as much regard as the Consubstantialists.

When Epiphanius says of their baptism, 'sunt qui narrent,' we may be sure that proofs ran very low with him.

The Eunomians seem to have been of opinion that it was not necessary for persons to be plunged all over in water, and that it was not decent for them to be stripped at the performance of this religious rite. They therefore only uncovered them to the breast, and then poured water upon their heads. This was enough to give their adversaries a pretext, though a poor one, to calumniate them, and to call them Manichæans, and to charge them with holding that the lower parts of the body were made by the devil.

That they worshipped Eunomius, and placed his writings above the New Testament, and despised the martyrs, are some of Jerom's usual figures of rhetoric, and arts of controversy, to set the populace against the Eunomians: he might as well have said that they had cloven feet, and rode upon broom-sticks in the air.

S. Basnage gives too much credit to such vague and improbable accusations. Epiphanius, a dealer in hearsays, was told by somebody that Ætius, an Arian bishop, talked loosely about fornication, and made a jest of it. *Ergo*, the Eunomians and the Arians were as corrupted in their manners as in their principles. What a weak and halting inference from precarious premises!

If the Eunomians re-baptized those who had already been baptized by Christians, they were much to be blamed for it; but the same fault was committed by Athanasius, and by those Consubstantialists who rejected Arian baptism as invalid and null.

I know not whether this Manichæan conceit of a double soul suggested to the first lord Shaftsbury an ingenious thought. 'He was wont to say, that there was in every one two men, the wise and the foolish, and that each of them must be allowed his turn. If you would have the wise, the grave, and the serious always to rule and have the sway, the fool would grow so peevish and troublesome, that he would put the wise man out of order, and make him fit for nothing: he must have his times of being let loose to follow his phansies and play his gambols, if you would have your business go on smoothly.' Locke's Memoirs. From such a passage as this, some of the antients would have concluded that Shaftsbury was a Manichæan.

Manes placed the Father in heaven, the Son in the sun and moon, and the Holy Ghost in the air; and in this notion of the Son, or the Λόγος, he seems to have adopted what the Persians held concerning Mithras. By the account of Sozomen, ii. 9, &c. it appears that in the fourth century the sun was the favourite deity of the Persians, as he had been of old, and he whom they most worshipped. The learned and philosophical Persians might perhaps honour the sun only as the symbol of the divinity; but the multitude, without question, terminated their worship in the sun, and he was their God, not the Supreme, but the next to him.

The Oriental theology contains some traces of a Trinity. We find in the Chaldæan or Zoroastrian Oracles, which were published by Stanley, and then by Le Clerc, in his philosophical works,

Πάντι γὰρ ἐν κόσμῳ λάμπει Τριὰς, ἧς Μόνας ἄρχει.

'Toto enim in mundo lucet Trinitas, cujus Unitas initium est.'

But this oracle seems to be the forgery or interpolation of

some Christian, or some Platonic philosopher, and the whole collection to be not only a stupid and senseless rhapsody, but spurious and of no authority.

The Manichæan notion, that the souls of the righteous went to the moon, agrees well enough with the Stoical doctrine, thus delivered by Lucan, ix. 6.

> 'Quodque patet terras inter, lunæque meatus,
> Semidei Manes habitant, quos ignea virtus
> Innocuos vita, patientes ætheris imi
> Fecit, et æternos animam collegit in orbes.'

See Lipsius Phys. Stoic. iii. 14.

Manichæus, says Augustin, thought that the moon was made of pure water, and the sun of pure fire. He would have been surprised if he had been informed that the moon has neither water nor atmosphere.

The Manichæans held that all should terminate in good, as far as human souls are concerned. Some of the *Dualists* seem also to have supposed that all moral and natural evil should cease at last, and the evil principle be abolished. But this opinion, if strictly considered, is by no means consistent with the doctrine of two principles; for if evil be unoriginated and self-existing, it must be indestructible; and though its modifications may be varied, it will remain in one shape or other: yet the destruction of *Arimanius*, and *Hades*, and the future felicity of mankind, is so set forth by some dualists [a].

The perfect Manichæans abhorred wine, which they called 'the gall of the prince of darkness.' Others before them had held wine in abomination, as being 'the blood of the giants.' Ἤρξαντο δὲ πίνειν ἀπὸ

[a] Ἔπεισι δὲ χρόνος εἱμαρμένος, ἐν ᾧ τὸν Ἀρειμάνιον λοιμὸν ἐπάγοντα καὶ λιμόν, ὑπὸ τούτων ἀνάγκη φθαρῆναι παντάπασι καὶ ἀφανισθῆναι, τῆς δὲ γῆς ἐπιπέδου καὶ ὁμαλῆς γενομένης, ἕνα βίον καὶ μίαν πολιτείαν ἀνθρώπων μακαρίων καὶ ὁμωγλώσσων ἁπάντων γενέσθαι. Plutarch. de Isid.

Τέλος ἀπολείπεσθαι [ἀπολεῖσθαι] τὸν Ἀδην, καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἀνθρώπους εὐδαίμονας ἔσεσθαι, μήτε τροφῆς δεομένους μήτε σκιὰν ποιοῦντας· τὸν δὲ ταῦτα μηχανησάμενον [μηχανησόμενον] θεὸν ἡρεμεῖν καὶ ἀναπαύεσθαι χρόνῳ καλῶς [χρόνον ἄλλως] μὲν οὐ πολὺν τῷ θεῷ ὥσπερ δὲ ἀνθρώπῳ κοιμωμένῳ μέτριον. Theopompus, Ibid.

Ψαμμητίκου, πρότερον δὲ οὐκ ἔπινον οἶνον, οὐδὲ ἔσπενδον, ὡς φίλιον θεοῖς, ἀλλ' ὡς αἷμα τῶν πολεμησάντων ποτὲ τοῖς θεοῖς, ἐξ ὧν οἴονται πεσόντων καὶ τῇ γῇ συμμιγέντων ἀμπέλους γενέσθαι. διὸ καὶ τὸ μεθύειν ἔκφρονας ποιεῖ καὶ παραπλήγας, ἅτε δὴ τῶν προγόνων τοῦ αἵματος ἐμπιπλαμένους. 'Bibere autem cœperunt a Psammeticho, cum neque bibissent ante, neque diis libassent vinum, non id gratum diis rati, sed sanguinem eorum qui aliquando bellum diis intulissent: ex quorum cadaveribus terræ permixtis putant vites esse ortas. Itaque etiam ebrietas insanos facit et abalienat mente, impletis hominibus sanguine suorum majorum. Plutarch. de Iside.

Perhaps Androcydes had this fable in view: 'Androcydes sapientia clarus ad Alexandrum Magnum scripsit, intemperantiam ejus cohibens; Vinum poturus, Rex, memento te bibere sanguinem Terræ.' Plinius, xiv. 5.

Jerom, Ambrose, and other fathers have declaimed against matrimony, and recommended monkish abstinence, almost as much as Manes, and have employed arguments as insignificant as those of the heretic.

Philosophy, natural, moral, and theological, hath received such great improvements in this and the last century, by the labours of the learned, and particularly the [a] learned of this nation, and the Manichæan hypothesis is so very weak in all its parts, that there is no danger in exposing it fairly and impartially to public view, and no occasion for the mean artifice of misrepresenting it, and of charging its favourers with [b] follies and enormities of which they were not guilty.

To suppose that matter, which is limited, dispersed, passive, and ever-divisible, is self-existing, independent, endued with sense, perception, life, and motion, essentially evil, and necessarily vitious; to add to this the spontaneous generation of evil dæmons and other evil beings out of this matter; to suppose God corporeally extended, and excluded from those parts of space which are occupied by body, but in all other respects perfect, is a system so un-

[a] Cudworth, Boyle, Locke, Newton, &c.

[b] See in Bayle's Dict. the Adamites and the Turlupins, who probably have been wronged as well as the Manichæans.

philosophical, that it can never hold up its head or make its fortune in these days, or, at least, it can never be adopted by men of any sense and judgment.

Milton, judiciously, introduces Satan talking of his origin and generation according to the Manichæan system: v.

> 'That we were form'd then say'st thou? and the work
> Of secondary hands, by task transferr'd
> From Father to his Son? strange point and new!
> Doctrine which we would know whence learn'd: who saw
> When this creation was? remember'st thou
> Thy making, while the Maker gave thee being?
> We know no time when we were not as now;
> Know none before us: self-begot, self-rais'd
> By our own quickning pow'r, when fatal course
> Had circled his full orb, the birth mature
> Of this our native heav'n.'

Bayle took a singular delight in adorning and improving the Manichæan objections against the doctrine of one self-existing principle, and endeavoured to show that, upon the supposition that God is the author of all things, it is impossible to defend his wisdom and his goodness against the difficulties which arise from his causing or permitting natural and moral evil. On the other hand he was very willing to allow that the Manichæan system was indefensible. The result of all this was, according to him, the triumph of scepticism, and the futility of human reason.

Many replies were made; and amongst others Le Clerc undertook to defend the justice, wisdom, and goodness of God against him, first in his Parrhasiana, and then in his Bibliotheque Choisie; in which controversy he had manifestly the advantage over Bayle.

A. D. 250. Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, in a letter to Fabius, bishop of Antioch, relates to him the following story; 'There was in our city an old Christian, one Serapion, whose conduct in other respects had ever been unblameable and exemplary, but who in the persecution had deserted, and afterwards had often begged to be forgiven and readmitted. His petition was rejected, and no regard was showed to him, because he had sacrificed.

Some time after he was taken very ill, and lay for three days senseless and speechless. On the fourth day he came to himself a little, and calling to him his grandson, Child, said he, how long will you detain me here? hasten, I beseech you, and release me. Go, call me one of the presbyters. When he had said this, he lost his speech again. The boy hastened to call a presbyter. It was in the night time, and the presbyter himself was sick. But as I had ordered that pardon should be granted to all those who lay a dying, (especially if they had humbly begged it before) that they might depart in faith and hope, he gave the child a portion of the eucharist, and ordered him to [a] dip it *in wine*, and give it to the dying man. As the youth was drawing near, the old man recovered his senses, and said, You are come, my child, but the presbyter, I know, could not come himself. Do as you were ordered, and give me my dismission. So he received the eucharist, and instantly gave up the ghost. Doth it not appear from this that he had his time prolonged, till he was thus dismissed in peace, and that his crime was remitted, for the sake of the many good actions which he had performed in the long course of a virtuous life?' Apud Euseb. vi. 44.

If this wonderful thing happened just as Dionysius hath related it, it tended to a good and edifying purpose, at a time when it was matter of debate in what manner 'Lapsed Christians' should be treated by the church; and it showed that sinners truly penitent were not to be harshly used by their brethren, and excluded from the hopes of salvation; and that God was ready to receive those who with humility, and sorrow, and resolutions of amendment returned to him.

This Dionysius of Alexandria was one of Origen's disciples; he is called by Jerom, 'Vir eloquentissimus,' he was held in great esteem by Eusebius and by all the antient Christians; and from the large extracts of his writings produced by Eusebius, he appears to have been a learned, critical, acute, ingenious, elegant author. He was of an

[a] Ἀποβρέξαι κελεύσας. Valesius, 'aqua intinctam.' But I think, with Louth, it should rather be rendered, 'vino tinctam.'

illustrious family, had received a polite education, had been a professor of rhetoric in the days of his Paganism, and afterwards was a bishop and a confessor.

He pretends to have had some visions and revelations; but whether it were really so, or whether he thought such sort of fictions harmless and lawful, or whether he had a warm imagination and was a little enthusiastical, it is impossible for us now to determine.

Some of the visions and revelations of those days seem to have been vouchsafed, to teach men that they might flee in time of persecution: but such admonitions were not extremely necessary, since the dictates of nature and reason taught it, and the Gospel had confirmed those dictates:

'Scimus, et hoc nobis non altius imprimet Ammon.'

CYPRIAN was made bishop of Carthage A. D. 248. It hath been said of him that he was fond of spiritual power, and it cannot entirely be denied: but he had factious ecclesiastics and troublesome schismatics to deal with, which might lead him to insist somewhat the more on his prerogatives; and it is certain that in one point he was for restraining episcopal encroachments. He highly approved and recommended the method of appealing to the people in the election of bishops, and of asking their consent and approbation, and of allowing them a negative. He thought that the bishops of a province had no right to make a cabal, and elect a bishop secretly by themselves, and obtrude him upon the church. But after Christianity was the established and the ruling religion, great inconveniences, and tumults, and seditions, and massacres arose from the popular elections of bishops, and ecclesiastical preferments became more [b] lucrative, and were thought more worthy of a battle, or of mean tricks and solicitations.

'—— omnium rerum vicissitudo est.'

[b] Cum ligneis uteremur calicibus, aureos sacerdotes habebamus: nunc aureos habemus calices, ligneos sacerdotes. Bonifacius Decret. part. iii. de Consecrat. distinct. i. can. 44.

Cyprian upon all occasions[c] consulted his own clergy and people, and desired their consent. The bishops of Rome at that time began to take upon them and to domineer, and Stephen, dealing about his censures and excommunications, behaved himself with indecency and arrogance towards Cyprian and many others, in the affair of rebaptizing.

In a council of Carthage, consisting, of eighty-seven bishops, Cyprian said to them, 'None of us ought to set himself up as a bishop of bishops, or pretend tyrannically to constrain his colleagues, because each bishop hath a liberty and a power to act as he thinks fit, and can no more be judged by another bishop, than he can judge another. But we must all wait for the judgment of Jesus Christ, to whom alone belongs the power to set us over the church, and to judge of our actions.' Du Pin inserted these words in his Biblioth. i. p. 164. to buffet the pope by the hand of Cyprian.

Many passages there are in Cyprian's writings containing high notions of episcopal authority and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Whilst he strenuously opposed the domination of one pope, he seemed in some manner to make as many popes as bishops, and mere 'arithmetical noughts' of the rest of the Christians; which yet, I believe, was not his intent.

In the persecution under Decius, he fled from Carthage, and was proscribed, and his effects were seized. He was censured by some persons as a deserter of his flock; but the decent constancy and the Christian piety with which he laid down his life afterwards, afford a presumption that he had not retired for want of courage.

His death was lamented even by many of the Pagans, whose esteem he had gained by his affable and charitable behaviour.

He often talks of his visions and revelations, some of which he had on occasions which in all appearance were small and inconsiderable enough, whilst he had none to

[c] 'Episcopus sine consilio clericorum suorum clericos non ordinet, et civium testimonium quærat,' say the Canons of the Fourth Council of Carthage A. D. 398. if they be genuine. The Canon however is very reasonable.

guide him and set him right in points of more importance. He appeals to these visions, and makes use of them to justify his conduct. It would be dealing too severely with him, considering his character in other respects, to ascribe this entirely to artifice and policy, and it would be more candid and charitable to suppose that with much piety he had a mixture of African enthusiasm, and that what he thought upon in the day he dreamed of at night, and the next morning took his dreams for divine admonitions. Some perhaps will choose to leave it ambiguous—'dum Elias venerit.'

In his treatise 'de Lapsis,' he relates some strange miracles, one of which is, that the 'consecrated bread' was turned into [d] a 'cinder,' in the hands of a profane person, who thus found, according to the proverb, 'Pro thesauro carbones.'

When the Corinthians showed a want of reverence and decency in receiving the Lord's Supper, what was the consequence? 'For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep.' The correction was solemn and tremendous: But of these 'transformations' what can we say? and how can we give credit to them?

There is a story of the same kind, of 'bread' turned into a 'stone,' related by Sozomen. An heretic of the sect of the Macedonians had a wife of the same sect. The man was converted by Chrysostom, and used many arguments in vain, to bring over his stubborn spouse. At last

[d] Macarius of Alexandria, a celebrated monk and saint of the fourth century, is said to have related this story,—that when the monks approached to the holy communion, and stretched out their hand to receive it, devils, under the figure of little ugly Æthiopian boys (who were only visible to Macarius) prevented the officiating priest, and gave to some of them coals instead of the consecrated bread; which bread, though to bystanders it seemed to be given by the priest and received by these monks, returned back again to the altar: whilst other monks, who were more pious and better disposed, when they approached to receive the sacrament, chased the evil spirits away, who fled with great terror and precipitation, because an angel who assisted at the altar put his hand upon the hand of the presbyter when he delivered the sacrament to these good men. This account is in the 'Vitæ Patrum,' and inserted, with a thousand more stories of the same kind, in Tillemont, H. E. viii. 641. To such a degree the boldness of feigning miracles, and the facility of admitting them, was carried in those days!

he told her that if she would not receive the Lord's Supper with him at church, he would live with her no longer. She consented, but was resolved to deceive him, and instead of eating the bread which the minister gave her, she took some which she had brought with her; but as she was biting it, it was turned into a stone in her mouth, a stone neither in substance or colour like other stones, and bearing upon it the impression of her teeth, &c. which made her repent, and publicly confess her crime, viii. 5. This happened about the end of the fourth century, and Sozomen can supply us with an hundred miracles as good. His sending unbelievers to the church to look at the stone which was kept there as a rarity, was very judicious.

We have an account of a far prettier and stranger stone than this, in Morhof, who had it from some editions of Thuanus: 'Mirabilis istius lapidis historia animo obversatur, regi Galliæ Henrico secundo per ignotum aliquem Barbarum oblati. Illam quidem narrat Thuanus, in prima illa editione minori Parisina, part. i. lib. 5. pag. 453. Reperitur et in Francofurtensi prima in fol. alteraque octavæ formæ, lib. 6. pag. ibi 217. hic 286. Sed in ceteris editionibus verba illa, nescio quam ob causam sublata. Pipinus, ad cujus testimonium provocat Thuanus, de eo ita ad Mizaldum scribit:' Nuper ex India Orientali regi nostro allatum hic vidimus lapidem, lumine et fulgore mirabiliter coruscantem; quique totus veluti ardens et incensus incredibili lucis splendore præfulget micatque. Is jactis quoquo versus radiis ambientem circumquaque aërem luce, nullis oculis fere tolerabili, latissime complet. Est etiam (quod bene notari velim) terræ impatientissimus: si cooperiri coneris, sua sponte et vi, facto impetu, confestim evolat in sublime. Contineri vero includive loco nullo angusto nulla potest hominum arte, sed ampla liberaque loca duntaxat amare videtur. Summa in eo puritas, summus nitor: nulla sorde aut labe coinquinatur. Figuræ species nulla ei certa, sed inconstans et momento commutabilis: cumque sit aspectu longe pulcherrimus, contrectari sese tamen non sinit, et si diutius adnitaris, vel obstinatius agas, incommodum affert: sicuti multi suo non levi malo, me præsente sunt experti. Quod si quid fortassis ex eo enixius conando adimitur, aut detrahitur, nam durus

admodum non est, fit, dictu mirum, nihilo minor. 'Hæc Pipinus, quæ miranda sunt,' &c. Morhof, Polyhist. l. i. c. 13. p. 127.

Some part of this description may suit well enough with a 'phosphorus:' but there seems to be a double meaning, and perhaps by the 'stone' we are to understand an 'allegorical *and* philosophical stone,' representing 'Urim and Thummim, Light and Truth;' a present fit to be made to kings, though seldom acceptable to them; a jewel whose lustre is sometimes too bright and dazzling for mortal eyes; which cannot be suppressed, diminished, and adulterated, but will prevail and triumph at last;

> 'Merses profundo, pulcrior evenit:
> Luctere, multa proruit integrum
> Cum laude victorem:

and which it is not safe to handle too much, for fear of burning one's fingers.

Is there any absurdity in supposing that this 'precious oriental stone,' which would not bear confinement, was 'The Holy Bible,' a copy or translation of which might have been presented to the king?

Mizaldus (in French Antoine Mizaud) wrote many books, as 'De Æromantia, De Secretis Hortorum, Planetologia, Secret de la Lune, Centuries,' &c. and was a trifling author, and a philosopher 'minorum gentium.' The description which Pipinus gives of the 'stone,' besides its allegorical meaning, contains an oblique banter of the 'philosophers' stone.'

One Comiers wrote a book called 'Traité des Phosphores,' in which he is of opinion that this 'stone' was a 'phosphorus: Clarissimus autor—varia phosphororum artificialium genera—describit, atque ut tam admirabilis inventi gloriam patriæ suæ vindicet, jam olim Fernelio, Henrici secundi medico famigeratissimo cognitum fuisse modum parandi phosphorum siccum fulgurantem, qui nunc communiter Kraftio adscribitur, et de ejus stupendis effectibus ipsum prolixe ac perspicue, lib. ii. de abditis rerum causis, c. 17. egisse affirmat. Is enim lapis Indicus lucidissimus, quem, Bononiæ, regi oblatum Thuanus memorat, et cujus mentionem Fernelius loc. alleg. facit, juxta Comierium

phosphorus fuit, a Fernelio arte factus, et per hominem ex India venientem in aulam missus, ut tanto pluris æstimaretur, nec, quum ejus compositio vulgaris facilisque esset, vilesceret. Verum an hæc ita recte dicta sint, viderint alii. Certe, qui Fernelium leget, haud obscure sentiet, historiolam de lapide ex India allato ænigma ignis et flammæ esse, quo fortasse Fernelius aliquibus suæ artis ac sectæ viris illudere voluit.' Acta Erudit. 1684. p. 246.

Le Clerc hath drawn up an account of Cyprian in his Bibl. Univ. xii. 207. See also Barbeyrac Morale des Peres, p. 131.

I would willingly have paid a greater deference to the authority and testimony of this pious father and martyr concerning visions and miracles; and if I dissent from him, it is not without some reluctance. I have no notion of differing from worthy persons, living or dead, for the sake of *singularity* or of *contradiction*, in which I can discern no charms, and neither pleasure nor profit. To an opinion commonly received, and received by good men, when I cannot assent, I am inclined to say,

'Invitus, Regina, tuo de litore cessi.'

But alas! *Opinion* is a Queen who will not accept of such excuses:

'*Illa* solo fixos oculos aversa tenebat;
Nec magis incepto vultum sermone movetur,
Quam si dura silex aut stet Marpesia cautes.'

Origen and other antient Christians ascribe to our Saviour this saying: Γίνεσθε δόκιμοι τραπεζῖται, τὰ μὲν ἀποδοκιμάζοντες, τὸ δὲ καλὸν κατέχοντες· that is, 'Act like skilful bankers, rejecting what is bad, and retaining what is good.' This precept is proper for all who apply themselves to the study of religious antiquities. Good and bad money is offered to them, and they ought to beware of the coin which will not pass current in the republic of letters, and in the critical world, and of that which is found light when weighed in the balance of the sanctuary.

FELIX of Nola is thought to have lived in the days of

Cyprian, though that be uncertain. Many miracles were wrought in his behalf, and after his death he wrought them himself in vast abundance; all which rests principally upon the credit of Paulinus bishop of Nola, a writer of the fifth century, as also upon that of Augustin, and Damasus: but their united testimonies are worth just nothing at all in this case, and indeed in any case where miracles are concerned.

THE Roman empire under Gallienus, A. D. 262. was terribly afflicted, by civil war, by a multitude of usurpers and petty tyrants, by famine and pestilence, and earthquakes, and an irruption of Barbarians on all sides. The behaviour of the Christians in these calamitous times was most excellent and exemplary, as was the compassionate care which they took of the sick and needy, at the hazard and at the expence of their own health, fortunes, and lives, whilst the conduct of the Pagans was the very reverse. Eusebius, vii. 22.

About this time the Goths, and other savage nations which dwelt by the Danube, took some Christian presbyters captives, and were taken captives by *them*; for these Christians, by the lovely force of a blameless behaviour and a holy life, and by the *miracles* which they wrought, converted many barbarians, and at the same time softened and civilized their manners. So says Sozomen, ii. 6. Eusebius mentions it not; but it is observable that Eusebius is often short and deficient in his account of the transactions in the *western parts*.

PAUL of Samosata, bishop of Antioch, was deposed for heresy, A. D. 270. If the account given of him by Eusebius be true, which there is no reason to suspect, he well deserved to be turned out of the church, even for his wicked behaviour, and for the many proofs which he gave of being only a nominal Christian. 'Les evêques du concile d'Antioche l'accusérent de tous les vices ordinaires aux evêques des grands sieges,' says Du Pin, very boldly, Bibl. Eccl. i. p. 214. It is absurd to suppose that *Paul* was fool enough to call himself *Jesus Christ*; though some have charged him with it. The bishops who con-

demned him accuse him of no such crime; and if he had been guilty of it, it would have been a circumstance in his favour, and a proof that he had lost his senses. They charge him, indeed, with affirming that Jesus Christ was a mere man, and with suffering himself to be called an angel come from heaven.

The synod which was assembled to examine the affair of Paul of Samosata, consisted of all the bishops, presbyters, and deacons, who could conveniently meet together. None were excluded. See Eusebius, vii. 29, 30.

ARNOBIUS, a valuable author, and of whose works a good edition is much wanted, lived in the time of Diocletian, and wrote about the end of the third century. He was a convert to Christianity, 'somniis compulsus,' says Jerom. He makes some objections to Paganism, which might have been retorted on Judaism and Christianity. He borrows much from Clemens Alexandrinus: for example, he says to the Pagans:

'Quis ex relliquiis Pelopis compactum esse Palladium prodidit? non vos? Quis Spartanum fuisse Martem? non Epicharmus auctor vester? Quis in Thraciæ finibus procreatum? non Sophocles Atticus, cunctis consentientibus theatris? Quis mensibus *in Arcadia* tribus et decem vinctum? non Melæ fluminis filius?'

Some words are dropped, which should be restored thus:—'theatris? *quis in Arcadia? non vos?* Quis mensibus tribus et decem vinctum? non Melæ fluminis filius?' iv. p. 143.

This is taken from Clemens Alexandrinus, who says, 'Mars, according to Epicharmus, was a Spartan; according to Sophocles, a Thracian; as others say, an Arcadian; and, as Homer informs us, was tied neck and heels for thirteen months. Ὁ ἀλλοπρόσαλλος οὗτος, καὶ ἀνάρσιος, ὡς μὲν Ἐπίχαρμός φησι, Σπαρτιάτης ἦν, Σοφοκλῆς δὲ Θρᾷκα οἶδεν αὐτόν. ἄλλοι δὲ Ἀρκάδα· τοῦτον δὲ Ὅμηρος δεδέσθαι φησὶν ἐπὶ μῆνας τρισκαίδεκα.

Τλῆ μὲν Ἄρης κ. τ. λ.

ANTONY the monk, aged thirty-five years, retired into a desert in Ægypt, A. D. 285. Athanasius hath written

his history, his visions, his conflicts with devils, the wonders which he wrought, and his great abomination for all heretics, particularly for the Arians. The eastern monks were, in general, firmly attached to the doctrine established by the Nicene council, upon which account they suffered much under the Arian emperor Valens. Sozomen, iii. 13. Socrates, iv. 22. Some *modern heretics*, so Tillemont calls them, have thought this life of Antony to be a spurious, or a much corrupted piece, as Rivetus, and Basnage in his *Exercitationes*. If they could have fully proved it, they would certainly have done a singular service to the manes of Athanasius. Yet Tillemont is quite angry, and says, 'James Basnage, a calvanist, hath undertaken to prove that this Life is not the work of Saint Athanasius, or that it has been extremely interpolated and corrupted. He offers no new reason for this assertion that is of the least moment, and nothing remarkable, except some silly and stupid, not to say impious jests, upon things most holy, and most worthy of God.' H. E. viii. p. 700. Now Basnage, Dissert. Epist. p. 136., seems to have given into this suspicion, partly through a very favourable opinion of Athanasius, and a persuasion that he could not transmit such things to posterity; for which reason Tillemont should have treated him more civilly.

Socrates, iv. 23. says that Antony saw the soul of Ammon the monk carried up into heaven by angels, and cites Athanasius for it, who has the very story in his Life of Antony. Sozomen relates the same tale, i. 14. and is thought to have taken his account of Antony from Athanasius. Du Pin is a little doubtful whether this Life of Antony be genuine, but determines for the affirmative. Bibl. ii. p. 41. and upon the whole, there is far more reason to receive it as genuine than to reject it as spurious. 'Ex scriptis Athanasii nullum est cui veterum plures testimonium perhibeant. Laudatur a Nazianzeno, Chrysostomo, Palladio, Hieronymo, &c. In tanta existimatione fuit de Vita Antonii liber, ut eo lecto nonnulli ad pietatem accensi fuerint.—Interea faciles largimur puram non esse, sed lutulentam nonnullis in locis fluere. Illud certe magni esse Athanasii credere non possumus. *Antonius*

bestiam vidit formâ humanâ ad femora usque; crura et pedes asinum,' &c. S. Basnage, Ann. iii. 38.

Athanasius loved the monks, and the monks loved him. One of them said to his disciples, 'When you find any fragment of the works of Athanasius, transcribe it; and if you have no paper, write it upon your garments.' This makes it probable that Athanasius did not neglect to write the life of Antony, and that he collected every rumour and report which tended to embellish and magnify his friend.

It is a custom with the Arabs, always to give a man a patient hearing, who tells romantic stories, and never to contradict him; and this is reckoned amongst them a rule of civility and politeness. By this rule, we must let the 'Life of Antony' pass uncensured, reserving to ourselves the liberty not to believe all that is related in it.

Antony, as if he had foreseen the tricks of the reliquemongers, desired to be buried where they might not find him, and make money of him. 'Ingressus montem interiorem, quem incolere solebat, post paucos menses in morbum incidit. Tum accersitis duobus ascetis, qui propter senium laboranti ministrabant, mandata pietatis inculcat, subjungit dein: *Si vobis de me cura est, meique tanquam patris non obliviscimini, corpus meum in Ægyptum transferri ne patiamini, ne forte reservent domi suæ. Meum ergo corpus sepelite, terráque contegite, et nemo præter vos locum sepulcri noscat. Vestes meas sic distribuite: Melotem unam date Athanasio episcopo, cum stragula, quam ab ipso novam accepi, nunc detritam reddo. Serapioni episcopo alteram date meloten, vobis cilicium servate. Quodque est reliquum, filii, salvete, Antonius enim hinc migrat, non amplius vobiscum moraturus. Finito sermone, postquam sunt ipsum osculati, pedibus ille porrectis, et quasi amicorum adventantium aspectu admodum lætatus, animam exhalavit.* Vit. Ant. Illi vero præceptis abbatis sui obtemperantes, defunctum sepeliunt, in loco, qui, præterquam binis istis ascetis, cunctis ignoratur mortalibus. At, A. D. 561. mira reliquiariorum sagacitas locum olfecit, ubi sacræ exuviæ recondebantur. Id

scripto prodit Victor in Chronico,' &c. S. Basnage, Ann. ii. 834.

Let us here insert the bold and generous remarks of Melchior Canus, a dominican monk and a bishop. 'Dolenter hoc dico potius quam contumeliose, multo a Laertio vitas philosophorum severius scriptas, quam a Christianis vitas sanctorum, longeque incorruptius et integrius Suetonium res Cæsarum exposuisse, quam exposuerint catholici, non res dico imperatorum, sed martyrum, virginum, et confessorum. Illi enim in probis aut philosophis, aut principibus, nec vitia, nec suspiciones vitiorum tacent, in improbis vero etiam colores virtutum produnt. Nostri enim plerique, vel adfectibus inserviunt, vel de industria quoque ita multa confingunt, ut eorum me non solum pudeat, sed etiam tædeat. Hos enim intelligo ecclesiæ Christi cum nihil utilitatis adtulisse, tum incommodationis plurimum. Nominibus parco, quoniam hujus loci judicium morum etiam est, et non eruditionis tantum, in qua liberior potest esse censura; nam quæ morum est, hæc debet esse et in vivos cautior, et in mortuos reverentior. Certum est autem, *qui ficte et fallaciter historiam ecclesiasticam scribunt, eos viros bonos atque sinceros esse non posse*, totamque eorum narrationem esse aut ad quæstum, aut ad errorem; quorum alterum fœdum est, alterum perniciosum. Justissima est Ludovici Vivis querela de historiis quibusdam in ecclesia confictis. Prudenter ille sane ac graviter eos arguit, qui pietatis loco duxerint mendacia pro religione fingere. Id quod et maxime periculosum est, et minime necessarium. Mendaci quippe homini ne verum quidem credere solemus. Quamobrem qui falsis atque mendacibus scriptis mentes mortalium invitare ad divorum cultum voluere, hi nihil aliud mihi videntur egisse, quam ut veris, propter falsa, adimatur fides, et quæ severe ab auctoribus plane veracibus edita sunt, ea etiam revocentur in dubium.'

The words of Ludovicus Vives, to which Melchior Canus refers us, are these: 'Quæ de (sanctis) sunt scripta, præter pauca quædam, multis sunt commentis fœdata, dum qui scribit, affectui suo indulget, et non quæ egit Divus, sed quæ ille egisse eum vellet exponit: ut vitam dictet

animus scribentis, non veritas. Fuere qui magnæ pietatis loco ducerent mendaciola pro religione confingere: quod et periculosum est, ne veris adimatur fides propter falsa; et minime necessarium, quoniam pro pietate nostra tam multa sunt vera, ut falsa tanquam ignavi milites atque inutiles oneri sint magis quam auxilio.' De Tradendis Disciplinis, l. v.

'By all which I have ever read of the old, and have seen of the modern monks, I take the preference to be clearly due to the last, as having a more regular discipline, more good learning, and less superstition amongst them than the first.' Thus Middleton; and what he says of the modern monks is just and reasonable. Many of them are to be honoured for their abilities, erudition, good sense, and humanity.

About A. D. 300, or somewhat sooner, arose a sect called *Hypsistarii*, and afterwards *Cœlicolæ*, who are mentioned in the Theodosian Code as heretics. They seem to have been persons who, rejecting idolatry, and polytheism, and all revealed religions, admitted only natural religion.

'Dixi Cœlicolas fuisse homines nullam religionem revelatam sive veram sive falsam admittentes, sed solam naturalem, quam ratio dictat, colentes. Contra quam interpretationem vir doctus objecit, tales homines ab ævo condito semper extitisse, Honorium vero atque Augustinum de Cœlicolis loqui, tanquam de secta nova. At non difficile est hæc in concordiam redigere: Homines quidem singulares, ita de religione sentientes, a priscis temporibus fuerunt; sed secta fuit nova, i. e. seculo demum tertio Cœlicolæ seipsos a Gentibus, Judæis et Christianis segregare, et in societatem coire cœperunt, electo *majore* seu patriarcha, et ritu baptismi instituto, quo in ecclesiam istam novam admitterentur. In his, quos Græci Ὑψιστάριους vocarunt, nomen suum professus erat in juventute Gregorius, pater Gregorii Nazianzeni.' Wetstenius, Proleg. in N. T. p. 38. Tillemont hath collected what he could find concerning this sect of *Deists*, with their *Grand Master*, H. E. xiii. 315. It is a wonder that they should have adopted the rite of baptism, unless they did it to appear to

the world as a sect of Christians, and to draw in silly people.

DIOCLETIAN'S persecution began A. D. 302. It was preceded by a great depravation of manners in the Christian church, both of the clergy and of the laity, says Eusebius. In these times of distress, as many worthy and pious bishops became martyrs and confessors, many unworthy ones were involved in the common calamity, and condemned to servile and infamous employments; and before the rage of the persecution was entirely abated, the Christian church suffered much from internal dissensions, from the cabals of ambitious men who wanted to be bishops, from irregular ordinations, and from schisms even amongst the orthodox and the confessors. Of these evils Eusebius makes slight and cursory mention, declaring that he chose to drop so melancholy a theme. He might have had good reasons for declining the task; but we cannot help wishing that we had an accurate and impartial account of the state of the church in those days. The love of governing, and the love of disputing and deciding, have been the parents of innumerable evils. De Mart. Pal. 12.

Diocletian's persecution was very severe, and lasted ten years. Eusebius, who lived at that time, hath given us a particular, an affecting, and an invaluable account of the martyrs under those dreadful trials. There was, says he, a youth not twenty years of age brought out to suffer, who stood untied, erect, holding his arms in form of a cross, praying earnestly to God, and never stirring from his place, nor changing posture, nor showing the least sign of fear; but full of calm resolution, whilst bears and panthers made up to him, and were roaring about him. The name of this young hero is lost, whilst so many names are preserved in Ecclesiastical History which might as well have slept in neglected oblivion.

At the same time Apphianus, who was not twenty years old, and who had been instructed by Eusebius, endured for three days together all the torments that diabolical cruelty could contrive. See also the account of the sufferings of Theodosia, who was not eighteen. Mart. Palæst. 7.

In the persecution under Marcus Aurelius and Lucius

Verus, Ponticus, a youth of fifteen years, after he had been brought forth, day after day, to see the torments which were inflicted on the Christians, suffered them himself, and died with the utmost constancy and resolution. Euseb. v. 1.

Amongst other punishments inflicted on the Christians, one was, to crucify them with their head downwards, Euseb. viii. 8. a barbarity which was practised in the days of Seneca, and which perhaps gave occasion to the story that St. Peter, at his own request, suffered this kind of martyrdom. 'Video istic cruces non unius quidem generis, sed aliter ab aliis fabricatas. Alii capite conversos in terram suspendere, alii per obscœna stipitem egerunt,' &c. Seneca Cons. ad Marc. 20.

Eusebius, in his history of Diocletian's persecution, is sparing of prodigies; but later writers have amply supplied that defect, and have mentioned ten thousand miracles, which may be found in Tillemont, E. H. v.

What Eusebius relates of this kind is:

That the wild beasts could not be compelled to touch the Christians who were exposed to them[a], particularly the young martyr whose name is not recorded, who was run through with a sword, and flung into the sea. He speaks as an eye-witness, and appeals to many then living for the truth of his narration. viii. 7.

That when the martyr Apphianus was killed and cast into the sea, a violent tempest suddenly arose which shook the whole city, and the waves cast his body back on the shore, of which all the inhabitants of Cæsarea were witnesses. De Mart. Pal. 4.

'Amne jubet mergi puerum, sceleus unda refugit.'

That the bodies of Pamphilus and of other martyrs who died with him, being exposed to the birds and beasts four days and nights, remained untouched, the divine

[a] Concerning this forbearance of the beasts, some remarks have been made, vol. i. p. 358. It should not be dissembled that, from the accounts given us by Eusebius and others, it appears that some martyrs were assaulted and wounded by wild beasts, and others were not touched by them.

providence so ordering it, and were honourably interred by the Christians. That is, to use the words of Statius:

> 'nec sontis iniqua tyranni
> Jussa valent; durant habitus et membra cruentis
> Inviolata feris, nudoque sub axe jacentes
> Et nemus, et tristis volucrum reverentia servat.'

The fact, we may suppose, is not to be denied; and as Pamphilus was a most dear and intimate friend of Eusebius, it was natural for the historian to interpret it thus. This, and more than this, might be allowed to sacred friendship and virtuous affection. 11.

That at Cæsarea, when the persecution raged, and the Christians lay up and down unburied, and the earth was strewed with their mangled limbs, though the day were bright and serene, the buildings ran down with drops, and the streets were wet with a sudden dew, as if the earth and the elements had wept at the sight of such barbarities. So said the Christians; and perhaps we should have said the same if we had lived then, and had been in their distressed condition. I doubt not, says Eusebius, that this will be called fiction and trifle by some readers.—But he adventured to record it, nor is there any reason why he should be scorned and insulted on that account, though probably there was nothing in it which did not arise from natural causes. Constantine seems to allude to the same thing, in his Edict, speaking of the persecution: τὸ τηνικαῦτα ἐδάκρυε μὲν ἀναμφιβόλως ἡ γῆ· ὁ δὲ τὰ σύμπαντα περιέχων κόσμος τῷ λύθρῳ χραινόμενος ἀπεκλάετο· ἥ γε μὴν ἡμέρα αὐτὴ, τῷ πένθει θαύματος ἐνεκαλύπτετο. 'Ea tempestate tellus quidem ipsa proculdubio lacrimas edidit: cœlum vero quod universa suo ambitu complectitur, cruore inquinatum ingemuit. Ipsa quoque diei lux, præ luctu atque horrore tanti prodigii obscurata est.' Apud Euseb. Vit. Const. ii. 52.

Eusebius, in his narration of Romanus, mentions nothing miraculous, ch. 2. and yet Prudentius, Chrysostom, and Eusebius himself in a Discourse De Resurrectione, talk of many and signal miracles on the occasion, as the fire being strangely extinguished in which he was to have been

burnt, his speaking plainly after his tongue was cut out, though he had naturally an impediment in his speech, and could not pronounce his own name, &c. Valesius wonders that Eusebius should thus differ from himself; to which it may be replied, that Eusebius the orator thought he might say what Eusebius the historian would not attest, and that his real sentiments must be learned from his history, and not from a sermon or a declamation. Tillemont is not quite fair, and slily dissembles this silence of Eusebius H. E. v. 206. But it is further to be observed, that the Opuscula of Eusebius, in which is the Discourse De Resurrectione, are extant only in Latin; and who knows what tricks the translator has played with them, and whether they be genuine or no? Eusebius is a name which belonged to more than threescore persons, and Cave is of opinion that these Opuscula were not written by the historian; and Tillemont himself is inclined, in another place, to give up this discourse. H. E. vii. p. 63.

Rufinus, in his version of Eusebius, added, and left out, and altered what he thought fit, and inserted a long account of the miracles of Gregory Thaumaturgus, of which Eusebius said not a word. The same insupportable licence he took in translating Origen; so that they are not versions, but perversions of the originals. However, Rufinus is so far honest, as to own that he uses such liberties. Jerom was guilty of the same fault, and they had nothing to reproach one another with on that score.

'It is agreed that St. Jerom may be the greatest saint of all translators, but that he is not the most exact. He hath taken liberties which the laws of translation will not admit; and his adversary Rufinus fails not to charge him with it,' &c. Baillet, Jug. des Savans.

Rufinus was *excommunicated* by Pope Anastasius, as an Origenist. He was not so good a *scholar*, but he might be as good a *saint* as Jerom, for any thing that we know to the contrary.

In this persecution Peter and Asclepius, the former a member of the church, the latter a Marcionite bishop, were burnt. 'Peter,' says Tillemont, 'went to heaven,

and Asclepius [b] to hell-fire.' But Eusebius, more decently and moderately, says, 'With Peter suffered Asclepius—through a zeal, as he thought, for piety, but not for that which is according to knowledge: however, they were consumed in one and the same fire.'

Many of the Marcionites suffered martyrdom at different times. Why were these men put to death? Because they were Heretics? No; but because they acknowledged Jesus to be the Son of God, and would not renounce him, and sacrifice to idols. See Beausobre, Hist. de Manich. ii. 120.

We read in the Alexandrian Chronicle, in Bollandus, and in the Menæa, that Gelasinus, or Gelasius, and Ardaleo, two pantomimes, as they were drolling on the stage, and feigning themselves Christians, were suddenly converted, and suffered martyrdom; and other stories of the same kind are recorded. See Tillemont, H. E. iv. 418—421. As to these two saints, Gelasinus and Ardaleo, (I suppose it should be Ardelio,) their names, joined to their profession, make the account suspicious, the one being 'Saint Harlequin,' and the other 'Saint Jackanapes:' for it is not probable that these were names of men, though the one might act the part of a 'Gelasinus,' and the other of an 'Ardelio.' *Gelasius*, indeed, is a name common enough.

In the time of Diocletian, there was a whole legion of Christians, called the 'Thebean Legion,' consisting of more than six thousand men, who suffered martyrdom by the orders of Maximian. Tillemont, H. E. iv. 421. This story hath never wanted patrons, antient and modern. It hath been defended by Tillemont, by Hickes, (who would

[b] Will men never be cured of the rash and malicious habit of always seeking in the corruption of the heart the origin of errors, which may be found more naturally and more innocently in the obscurity in which God hath judged it proper to leave certain truths, and in the weakness of the human understanding? Beausobre, Hist. de Manich. i. p. 28.

have called any man *an atheist* for deriding it,) and by many others.

As it would not be fair to dissemble the evidence for it, let it be observed that it stands upon the authority of one Eucherius, bishop of Lyons, and a writer of the fifth century, who had it from the bishop of Geneva, who had it from Theodorus, another bishop, who had the honour and felicity to find the reliques of these martyrs by *revelation*, and perhaps by the *smell* of the *bones*. Thus it terminates in a miracle; but

'Nil agit exemplum litem quod lite resolvit.'

'About the time of Diocletian's persecution, or a little after, a council of the Eastern churches was held at Seleucia, to reform the abuses which Papas, patriarch of Seleucia, had introduced into ecclesiastical discipline, to examine many heavy accusations laid against him, and to hear the complaints of the bishops, who were justly offended at his insolence. Milles, bishop of Susa, censured him for it with much freedom and gravity. Whence arises, said he, this arrogance of yours, this contempt for your brethren the bishops, who have done nothing to merit such treatment? Do you then look upon the precepts of Jesus Christ as upon fables? or know you not that he hath said, Let him who is chief among you be as though he were the servant of others? Stupid animal, replied Papas, it becomes thee truly to teach me what I know better than thou dost! At these words Milles took the Gospels out of his breast, and put the book upon a cushion; and addressing himself to Papas, said, If you are ashamed to learn your duty from me, who am but a mortal man, learn it at least from this Gospel, which you see plainly enough with the eyes of the body, but not with the eyes of the understanding. Then Papas, like a man frantic and possessed, striking the sacred book with his hand, cried out, *Speak then, Gospel, speak.* Milles, hearing these profane words, took up the book, and turning himself to the people, who were many in number, he put it to his mouth, and to his eyes, and then raising his voice, O proud man, said he to Papas,

the angel of the Lord will punish thy insult against the word of everlasting life. One half of thy body shall wither in a moment, that so sudden a punishment may be a conspicuous proof of the just severity of God against the proud and the profane. But thou shalt not die presently; God will continue thy life for some years, because he will make of thee an example for those who are like thee. On the instant Papas fell to the ground, and was struck with a palsy, which took away the use of one side of his body; and in this condition he lived twelve years, and then died. This happened A. D. 314.

'Such is the relation which the Syrians have given us of Papas, primate of the East. Our age has little faith for the *marvellous*, and chooses rather to ascribe such events to natural causes; and indeed violent fits of anger have sometimes brought on palsies[c]. But it is not unsuitable to Divine Providence so to order second causes, that the punishment of a notorious sinner shall tread close upon his crime, and that even the incredulous shall never be able to determine that there is nothing miraculous in it.' Beausobre, Hist. du Manich. i. p. 184.

Beausobre took this account from Asseman's Bibl. Orientalis, and refers the reader to it.

Milles, as Sozomen relates, was at first a soldier in the Persian army, embraced Christianity, and was made bishop of a city in Persia, where he was often cruelly used and beaten by the infidels. Finding that his labours amongst them were unsuccessful, and that he could not make one proselyte, he departed thence, having pronounced a malediction on the city, which not long after was destroyed by the king, together with its inhabitants. Setting out as a pilgrim, and carrying with him nothing but the Gospel, he

[c] The death of Nerva and Valentinian the First is ascribed to a violent fit of anger; and to descend from emperors to lower persons, we read that a master of Trinity college in Cambridge scolded himself into a palsy: but these are no objections to the story here related, according to which the distemper was foretold by a good man, and inflicted upon a bad man; and there is nothing in the account itself that should incline us to reject it.

went to visit Jerusalem; thence he travelled to Ægypt, to see the monks[d], and returning home, he suffered martyrdom with many other Persian Christians, in the persecution under Sapor, about A. D. 340. He is said to have wrought miracles.

This account Sozomen took from Syrian writers, ii. 14.

We are now coming to the age of Constantine, to the faint struggles of expiring Paganism, to Christianity by law established[e], and to a church blessed, perhaps, with prosperity and virtue: but it is hard for men to join these two together in stable alliance, which so many causes concur to keep asunder. From the age of Constantine the Divine Providence so ordered it, that Christianity was the reigning religion in the Roman empire, under Christian emperors, a small interval excepted in the reign of Julian; and this seems to have been necessary for its support. In process of time it was so much altered and defaced, that, without the protection of the civil magistrate, it might have been in danger, and Paganism new-modelled and refined by philosophers might have found too many advantages over it. Thus things went on from bad to worse, till the reformation rescued the Gospel in some degree from the vile hands into which it was fallen. Such was the state of religion for many ages;

> 'Nihil aderat adjumenti ad pulchritudinem,
> ut ni vis boni
> In ipsa inesset forma, hæc formam extinguerent.'

But Christianity, at the very worst, and under the greatest disadvantages, could not lose all her excellence, and undoubtedly produced good effects on thousands and ten thousands, whose lives are not recorded in ecclesiastical

[d] Perhaps, to see whether the great things which fame reported concerning them were true.

[e] The completion of the prophecies, in the establishment of Christianity, and in the destruction of the persecuting princes, shall be considered in another volume, Deo volente.

history; which, like other history, is for the most part a register of the vices, the follies, and the quarrels of those who made a figure and a noise in this world [f].

The sacred writers foretold this fatal change and great apostasy; and thus the Divine Providence, which brings good out of evil, caused the very corruption of Christianity to be one proof of its truth.

[f] Socrates, in the close of his work, observes, that, if men were honest and peaceable, historians would be undone for want of materials.

REMARKS

ON

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

Διὰ δυσφημίας καὶ εὐφημίας.

THE THIRD VOLUME.

TO THE

MOST REVEREND

THOMAS,

LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

My Lord,

As the foregoing volume had the advantage of appearing under the patronage of a name so highly respected and esteemed, I beg leave to present this also to your Grace, for whom alone it ever was intended.

The church of Christ increasing in splendor, and decreasing in virtue; the origin and progress of superstition and spiritual tyranny; the unhappy controversies which signalized the fourth century; the councils called to compose these disputes, and never answering the purposes for which they were designed; the character of the ecclesiastical historians who have transmitted to us the memory of these events; the laws of the first Christian emperor, which, like himself, had a mixture of good and bad; the accomplishment of the prophecies in the destruction of the persecutors of Christianity; the state of the Jews ever since their rejection, and

the hopes which Christians entertain that God in his appointed time will show mercy and favour to his once chosen people; These are the subjects which I have endeavoured to examine and discuss, without adulation or dissimulation, with sober liberty and disinterested inquiry, and which I offer to your Grace, with gratitude, respect, and affection, as to a most candid and impartial judge; wishing, with the public, that your health may be established, and that you may long continue an ornament and a blessing to the church and state.

I am, my Lord,

Your Grace's most obliged

and obedient humble servant,

JOHN JORTIN.

REMARKS

ON

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

A. D. 311. CONSTANTINE being disposed to protect and embrace Christianity, which his father had greatly favoured, and about to fight Maxentius, prayed to God for his assistance. As he was marching, he saw in the afternoon, in the sky, over the sun, a shining cross, with this inscription, τούτῳ νίκα, joined to it. The sight astonished him, and the army which accompanied him. This he related to Eusebius with his own mouth, and sware to the truth of it, at a time when many of the soldiers were living. Ἀμφὶ μεσημβρινὰς ἡλίου ὥρας ἤδη τῆς ἡμέρας ἀποκλινούσης, αὐτοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἰδεῖν ἔφη ἐν αὐτῷ οὐρανῷ ὑπερκείμενον τοῦ ἡλίου σταυροῦ τρόπαιον ἐκ φωτὸς συνιστάμενον, γραφήν τε αὐτῷ συνῆφθαι, λέγουσαν, τούτῳ νίκα. 'Horis diei meridianis, sole in occasum vergente, crucis tropæum in cœlo ex luce conflatum, soli superpositum, ipsis oculis se vidisse affirmavit, cum hujusmodi inscriptione: *Hac vince.* Euseb. Vit. Const. i. 28.

Concerning this story there have been these opposite opinions:

That it was a miracle, wrought in favour of Constantine and of Christianity:

That it was a pious fraud, a mere stratagem of Constantine, to animate his soldiers, and to engage the Christians firmly on his side.

Fabricius, as an 'honorarius arbiter,' comes between both, and allows the fact, but rejects the miracle. Bibl. Gr. vi. 8.

There is, says he, a natural appearance, a 'solar halo,' which sometimes represents a lucid cross; and this is so rarely seen, that it is no wonder if Constantine, and they who beheld it with him, accounted it miraculous, especially at that juncture.

If this were no miracle, yet it tended to the service of Christianity, and to bring about the great revolution which then happened.

There are in historians, antient and modern, and in the 'Philosophical Transactions,' descriptions of such phænomena, and also of lucid circles or crowns accompanying them. Fabricius gives an account and a representation of some.

Thus far all goes well enough: but the great difficulty is the inscription, τούτῳ νίκα, for which Fabricius offers this solution, that γραφὴ [a] means a 'picture,' as well as a 'writing,' and that λέγειν, when applied to a picture or image, means to 'denote' or 'imply,' and that the words of Constantine and Eusebius may be thus interpreted: To the cross was adjoined a picture or image, intimating that by this he should conquer; which image was a lucid crown, a representation or symbol of victory.

To this I add, that Eusebius, by not using the words

[a] Eusebius uses γραφὴ for 'a picture,' speaking of the cross represented in a picture of Constantine. Ὁ μὲν δὴ καὶ ἐν ΓΡΑΦΗΙ ὑψηλοτάτῳ πίνακι πρὸ τῶν βασιλικῶν προθύρων ἀνακειμένῳ, τοῖς πάντων ὀφθαλμοῖς ὁρᾶσθαι προὐτίθει, τὸ μὲν σωτήριον ὑπερκείμενον τῆς αὐτοῦ κεφαλῆς ΤΗ ΓΡΑΦΗ, παραδούς· τὸν δὲ ἐχθρὸν καὶ πολέμιον θῆρα, τὸν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ τῆς τῶν ἀθέων πολιορκήσαντα τυραννίδος, κατὰ βύθου φερόμενον ποιήσας ἐν δράκοντος μορφῇ.—διὸ καὶ βασιλεὺς ὑπὸ τοῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ, τῶν αὐτοῦ παίδων, βέλει πεπαρμένον κατὰ μέσου τοῦ κήτους, βυθοῖς τε θαλάσσης ἀπερριμμένον, διὰ τῆς κηροχύτου ΓΡΑΦΗΣ ἐδείκνυ τοῖς πᾶσι τὸν δράκοντα.—ὃν καὶ δυνάμει τοῦ ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς ἀνακειμένου σωτηρίου τροπαίου, κατὰ βυθῶν ἀπωλείας κεχωρηκέναι ἐδήλου. 'Quinetiam in sublimi quadam tabula ante vestibulum palatii posita, cunctis spectandum proposuit salutare quidem signum capiti suo superpositum: infra vero hostem illum et inimicum generis humani, qui impiorum tyrannorum opera ecclesiam Dei oppugnaverat, sub draconis forma in præceps ruentem.—Idcirco imperator draconem telis per medium ventrem confixum, et in profundos maris gurgites projectum, sub suis suorumque liberorum pedibus cera igne resoluta depingi proponique omnibus voluit:—quem salutaris illius tropæi quod capiti ipsius superpositum erat, vi ac potentia in exitii barathrum detrusum esse significabat.' Vit. Const. iii. 3.

στοιχεῖα or γράμματα, nor mentioning in what language it was written [b], seems to speak rather of an emblem or picture, than of a writing.

Add to this, that in the standard which Constantine ordered to be made in form of a cross, in memory of this omen, he placed a crown of gold and jewels on the top of it, and a cypher denoting the name of Christ, but not the words τούτῳ νίκα. Euseb. Vit. Const. i. 31.

Amongst the 'Panegyrici Veteres,' the eighth is in praise of Constantine, and celebrates his victory over Maxentius, but says not a word of the cross. The author of this Panegyric was a Pagan. The ninth also, composed by Nazarius, is silent concerning this prodigy. One of the panegyrists speaks of a bad omen, by which he might mean the cross. See Tillemont, H. des Emp. iv. 632. Not.

But, after all, it seems rather more natural to interpret γραφὴν λέγουσαν, of a writing than of a picture. It is an ugly circumstance, and I wish we could get fairly rid of it.

Licinius, if we may believe the writer 'de Mortibus Persecutorum,' was instructed by an angel how to obtain the victory over Maximinus, cap. xlvi. p. 276. This seems to have been a military stratagem of Licinius, to regain the favour of the Christians, and to animate his soldiers.

It hath been controverted whether Licinius ever were a Christian. Cardinal Noris takes the negative, Pagi and Basnage the affirmative. The truth of the case seems to have been, that he pretended for some time to be a Christian, but never was so; and that finding the Christians to be much more fond of Constantine than of himself, he threw off the mask. See S. Basnage, Ann. ii. 667.

When the church, under Constantine and his successors, enjoyed the protection of the civil powers, the Christians compared their present with their past condition, and called to mind the sufferings of their predecessors, and the

[b] Philostorgius supplies that defect, and says that it was in Latin: 'In hoc vince.' p. 478. But Philostorgius did not see it, and his testimony ought to go for nothing.

patience and fortitude which they had exerted, particularly in the last and severest persecution. These considerations raised in them a high, and indeed a just veneration for the martyrs: but it did not stop here; it ran into excess, and produced bad effects. Every rumour concerning the behaviour of those saints was received without due examination, the number of the sufferers was augmented, the sufferings of some of them were exaggerated, and many fictitious miracles were added to the account. Their bodies were discovered by the help of visions and revelations, and were said to emit perfumes, and to work miracles without end. This drew a great resort to their graves, and every one had his story to tell of the benefits which himself or his neighbour had received. To have been suspicious or slow of belief on such occasions, would have passed for little better than atheism; and thus the phrensy grew epidemical. In the time of Augustin, many real or pretended monks went strolling about, as hawkers and pedlars, selling the bones and reliques of martyrs [c]. August. de Op. Monach. 28.

The Fathers of those times, as Athanasius, Gregory Nazianzen, and who not, but particularly Chrysostom with his popular eloquence, contributed to the utmost of their power to encourage the superstitious veneration and invocation of saints, the love of monkery, and the belief of miracles wrought by monks and reliques. Some of these Fathers, particularly Gregory, were in other respects valuable men; but this was the distemper of the age, and they were not free from it. See Chrysostom, t. i. Orat. 40. p. 485. ed. Par.

Thence arose religious addresses to the martyrs, who were considered as patrons and intercessors, which tended to lessen the reliance and gratitude due to Christ, and to substitute new expedients in the room of rational piety and strict morality; and those Christians who were conscious of their own defects, began to pay immoderate honours to the martyrs, that by their interest they might obtain remission of sins. Prudentius, who had a fine genius, and

[c] See a dissertation of Mabillon, 'De Cultu Sanctorum ignotorum,' in the Act. Erud. 1699. p. 107.

was a good poet for the time in which he flourished, to atone, as he says, for the follies of his youth, spent his latter days in defending the Catholic faith, and in composing hymns to the martyrs, and expresses his hopes that Saint Romanus would do him a considerable service at the day of judgment, for the sake of a poem in which he had celebrated that martyr.

> ‘ Vellem sinister inter Hœdorum greges
> Ut sum futurus, eminus dinoscerer,
> Atque hoc precante, diceret rex optimus,
> Romanus orat, transfer hunc hœdum mihi;
> Sit dexter agnus; induatur vellere.

Περὶ Στεφ. 10. ad fin.

These practices suited the half-converts and nominal Christians, who came over for the loaves, under Christian emperors. The gay and splendid appearance of the church helped to allure them; they found new religious amusements to make up for those which they had quitted, and if they were superstitious before, they might be so still, ‘ mutatis mutandis.’ In the room of gods and goddesses, they had saints male and female, lord and lady protectors, to whom they might pay their respects; and instead of sleeping in their old temples, they could slumber over the bones of the martyrs, and receive as good information and assistance. If they longed for miracles, portents, prodigies, prophecies, visions, dreams, omens, divinations, amulets, charms, &c., they might be supplied.

Thus the Fathers of the fourth century, in general, introduced an irregular worship of the saints. I am sorry that I cannot entirely acquit Eusebius upon this head: He speaks thus in his *Præparatio*, xiii. 11. “ Τῶν δὲ δὴ ἀποθανόντων ἐπὶ στρατείας, ὃς ἂν εὐδοκιμήσας τελευτήσῃ, ἆρ᾽ οὐ πρῶτον μὲν φήσομεν τοῦ χρυσοῦ γένους εἶναι; Πᾶν γε μάλιστα. Ἀλλ᾽ οὐ πεισόμεθα Ἡσιόδῳ, ἐπειδάν τινες τοῦ τοιούτου γένους τελευτήσωσιν, ὡς ἄρα,

> Οἱ μὲν, δαίμονες ἁγνοὶ ἐπιχθόνιοι τελέθουσιν,
> Ἐσθλοὶ, ἀλεξίκακοι, φύλακες μερόπων ἀνθρώπων;

Πεισόμεθα μὲν οὖν. Διαπυθόμενοι ἄρα τῷ Θεῷ, πῶς χρὴ

τοὺς δαιμονίους τε καὶ θείους τιθέναι, καὶ τίνι διαφόρῳ, οὕτω καὶ ταύτῃ θήσομεν, ἢ ἂν ἐξηγῆται. Τί δ' οὐ μέλλομεν; Καὶ τὸν λοιπὸν δὴ χρόνον, ὡς δαίμονας γεγονότας, οὕτω θεραπεύσομέν τε, καὶ προσκυνήσομεν αὐτῶν τὰς θήκας. Τὰ αὐτὰ δὲ ταῦτα νομιοῦμεν, ὅταν τις γήρᾳ, ἢ τινι ἄλλῳ τρόπῳ τελευτήσῃ, τῶν ὅσοι ἂν διαφερόντως ἐν τῷ βίῳ ἀγαθοὶ κριθῶσι." Καὶ ταῦτα δὲ ἁρμόζει ἐπὶ τῇ τῶν θεοφιλῶν τελευτῇ, οὓς στρατιώτας τῆς ἀληθοῦς εὐσεβείας οὐκ ἂν ἁμάρτοις εἰπών, παραλαμβάνεσθαι. ὅθεν καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς θήκας αὐτῶν, ἔθος ἡμῖν παριέναι, καὶ τὰς εὐχὰς παρὰ ταύταις ποιεῖσθαι, τιμᾶν τε τὰς μακαρίας αὐτῶν ψυχὰς, ὡς εὐλόγως καὶ τούτων ὑφ' ἡμῶν γιγνομένων. "Jam vero (inquit Plato) qui post egregia virtutis exempla, honestam in bello mortem occubuerint, numquid eos in primis ex aureo illo genere fuisse dicemus? Maxime vero. Num etiam Hesiodum audiemus, dum ex eo genere qui vivendi finem fecerint, de illis ita pronunciat,

> 'Sunt alii heroes casti, terrasque frequentant,
> Atque ultro mala depellunt, hominesque tuentur?'

Sane audiemus. Consulto itaque numine, quonam heroes illos ac semideos ritu, quove discrimine consecrari oporteat, religiose omnino quicquid responderit, observabimus. Enimvero faciendum id erit. Tum illos deinceps tanquam heroas venerabimur, eorumque sepulcra sanctiore cultu prosequemur. Eadem porro statuimus, ubi quis post vitam cum excellentis probitatis opinione traductam, supremum aut senio, aut alio quovis modo diem obierit." Hæc Plato. Quæ quidem in hominum Deo carissimorum obitus egregie conveniunt, quos veræ pietatis milites jure appellaris. Nam et eorum sepulcra celebrare, et preces ibi votaque nuncupare, et beatas illorum animas venerari consuevimus, idque a nobis merito fieri statuimus.[x]

This, though it contain no direct invocation of saints, inclines too much towards it. Therefore Vigerus thought it worthy of a marginal note, and writes '*martyrum cultus*,' lest the unattentive reader should pass it by.

The argument stands thus: Why should not we Christians show the same regard to our saints and martyrs which the Pagans paid to their heroes? and the argument,

together with the authority of Plato in this point, is good for nothing.

'Montfaucon observes, that Eusebius[d], p. 486. testifies that the good actions of holy men, which he calls their merits, may be beneficial, after their death, to him who shall pray to God to show him mercy for their sakes. This may be admitted in some sense; for, after all, God may, if he think fit, show favour to a person for the memory of a saint: but as it is Jesus Christ who is the sole foundation of our redemption, and as he has ordered us to pray to God only in his name, it is much more safe to hold fast to that, and not to establish from our own head, new forms of devotion, which were unknown in the apostolical times, and which at last grew to an excess that was past all bearing.' Le Clerc, Bibl. A. et M. iv. 16.

To observe a proper mean in the public respect due to departed saints was a difficult point, and required more care and caution than the Fathers and Ecclesiastics of the fourth century thought fit to bestow upon it. Nothing seemed more reasonable than to celebrate suffering virtue, and to reverence those illustrious persons who had preferred duty to riches, honours, pleasures, and length of days. Gratitude, and dear affection, and friendship, and every commendable disposition, pleaded for such a practice, and by it a holy emulation was kindled, and Christians were excited to imitate those whom they admired, and whom they saw thus honoured and praised. But the transition from lawful to unlawful veneration was easily made; and as the Pagans from honouring their heroes soon began to deify them, it was easy to foresee that the Christians who were come over, or half over from Paganism, would behave themselves much in the same manner towards saints and martyrs, unless they were diligently restrained. And yet the Fathers, instead of guarding against this rising evil, gave it encouragement by their many indiscretions.

Hubertus Languetus, in one of his Epistles, observes, that the day of the martyrdom of John Huss was kept at

[d] In his Commentary on the Psalms, published by Montfaucon.

Prague with a solemnity approaching to superstition. 'Ita autem celebratur ejus memoria, ut ea res aliquid superstitionis mihi habere videatur.' It may be so; but if a little enthusiasm and superstition be pardonable in any case, it is in paying honours to those worthies, who were massacred by cruel bigots and by nominal Christians, and who acted or suffered in defence of liberty civil or religious—names far more venerable than one half of those which fill up the calendars and martyrologies. There is no great danger that protestants should ever run into such excess as to worship their heroes and martyrs.

Praying at the tombs of the martyrs was one of the fooleries which the Fathers should have restrained. What an idea did it give to weak Christians of the Almighty, who ought to be worshipped in spirit and in truth? As if He could be supposed to show more favour to a petition, because it was offered up at the place where a good man lay buried?

As the honours paid to the dead and to the reliques of the martyrs were set forward and supported, though not entirely, yet principally by the Consubstantialists, the Arians seem to have been rather less disposed to run into these puerilities. Faustus the Manichæan reproaches the Catholic Christians with their endless superstitions of this kind, and tells them that they were no better than humble imitators of Pagan idolaters.

What the Pagans said of their gods coming at certain times to visit their cities, the Christians afterwards said of their saints. See Valesius on Euseb. p. 445, 6.

'Juturna Nympha, quæ juvaret. Itaque multi ægroti propter id nomen, hinc aquam petere solent,' says Varro. For the same reason women big with child sacrificed to Egeria, 'quod eam putarent facile fœtum alvo egerere.' Festus.

In like manner Christians have adored those saints whose names resembled their diseases, their wants, their trades, &c. See La Motthe Le Vayer, Hexam. Rustique, p. 136, &c. who banters these superstitions of those of his own communion.

The sufferings of the martyrs had another effect upon persons of more zeal than prudence, and of a fervid and

fanatical disposition. The times of martyrdom were over, and that sort of courage and constancy could not be exerted; and therefore pious people contrived a method of voluntary martyrdom, and inflicted upon themselves as many pains and penalties as Pagan cruelty had invented. They left parents, wives, children, friends, families, and fortunes; they retired from the world, they obliged themselves to a single and solitary life, they allowed themselves no more food, raiment, and sleep, than would just keep body and soul together; and in these austerities, to do them justice, there was usually no dissimulation; all was performed in earnest. Several of them, as Theodorus and Symeon Stylites, when their mothers or sisters came to visit them, and earnestly begged admittance, would not be seen. When any of them quitted their retirement and returned to the world, they were considered as apostates, and men lost to goodness; but they might enter into the church.

At first they set at defiance all learning, as useless or pernicious, and imitated their father Antony, who was entirely illiterate. They spent their time working with their hands, and in silence, prayer, and contemplation: but afterwards, when they were formed into societies, they betook themselves to study.

They dwelt apart, each in his hole, so that most of them kept sad company; and by this moping and ever-musing life they were prepared and qualified to dream dreams, and see visions, and to converse with angels and dæmons; and many miracles were said to be wrought by them, which found easy credit and reception in a credulous age.

The devils used often to appear to the monks in the figure of Æthiopian boys or men; and thence, probably, the painters learned to make the devil black.

Evagrius, an adorer of monkery, hath given us a strange account of the monks of Palæstine in the fifth century. Some, says he, shut up in monasteries, exercise all sorts of macerations; some dwell in little dens of the earth just big enough to hold them; others, of a more eminent degree, males and females, repair to desert places, wearing nothing except a small covering of their nakedness; and

walking upon all four, eat grass and roots like the beasts, and if they see any passenger, they run away and hide themselves. Another sort of monks, more perfect than all the former, haunt the cities and the places of the greatest resort, *pretending to be mad*, and run into public houses[c], and eat and drink with any sort of people, and frequent the baths continually, and above all seek out the company of the women who go thither, and wash themselves along with them, &c. 'Balnea publica frequenter adeunt, et simul cum mulieribus diversantur et lavant. Adeo omni perturbatione animi superiores, ut naturæ ipsi vim inferant, et nec aspectu, nec tactu, nec amplexu ipso mulieris, ad ea quæ naturæ ipsorum propria sunt, inclinari queant. Sed cum viris quidem viri sunt, feminæ vero cum feminis. Non enim unius, sed utriusque simul sexus esse cupiunt.' i. 21. You may think perhaps that Evagrius intended to insult or ridicule them. 'Tis no such thing; he is very serious.

Gregory Nazianzen, celebrating the absurd austerities and mortifications of the monks of Nazianzum, tells us that some of them, through an excess of zeal, killed themselves, to be released from the wicked world, p. 107.

Pachomius the monk earnestly exhorted his disciples to discover without delay their temptations to the wisest of their brethren, by whom they might be instructed how to get the victory over them, lest by concealing them too long, they should be carried to horrible extremities; for he assured them that many upon that account had flung themselves from the rocks, had cut open their bellies, and had killed themselves in various ways. Tillemont H. E. vii. 199. Nothing is more probable than that such a course of life should produce melancholy madness.

Some of the philosophers had exercised strange severities upon themselves and upon their disciples, from the days of Pythagoras down to the time of Lucian, who introduces the philosopher Nigrinus as condemning such practices, and observing that they had occasioned the death of several persons. Vol. i. p. 67. where Hemsterhusius says, 'Christiani ascetæ, postquam vestitum veterum philosophorum

[c] 'into brothel-houses,' says Nicephorus.

adsciverant, hæc quoque quæ Lucianus merito deridet, præpostera formandæ pietatis instrumenta non spreverunt; quo de genere non pauca reperies in Vitis Patrum, et Cassiani Institutionibus. Multa notant, sed admodum perturbate.' Cresoll. Th. Rhet. v. 6, 7. Boilav. Hist. Flag. c. iv. p. 78.

They who had not the resolution to join themselves with these monks, yet admired what they would not imitate, 'and all the people magnified them.'

Monkery was pretty well established in the time of Constantine. It began in the Eastern countries, in Ægypt, Palæstine, and Persia, before it was introduced into the Western parts of the Roman empire.

'Palladius was a friend of Rufinus and of St. Chrysostom, a defender of Origen, a favourer of Pelagius, and an adversary of Saint Jerom. His history of the monks, and of their miracles, contains, like most other accounts of this kind, many extraordinary things. Amongst several instances of solid virtue and useful reflections, we find in it childish observations, examples which it would be dangerous to imitate, extravagant austerities, unreasonable actions, and injudicious enterprises.' Du Pin.

Palladius was a bishop, and had been a monk himself. He wrote the lives of the monks down to his own time, to A. D. 420. His book is called 'Historia Lausiaca,' a work, says Fabricius, 'quod nemo leget sine summa admiratione studii incredibilis quo viri illi et feminæ tam enixe conati sunt austeritate vitæ celebis et solitariæ, cultu durissimo, inedia ac jejuniis vix humanis, et abstinentia ab omnibus commodis vitæ, assequi sanctimoniam. Quanquam hanc in longe aliis rebus consistere, aliis peti alique, neque in solitudines esse relegandam, et cum conjugio et societate hominum neutiquam pugnare tum sacræ literæ tum ratio sana et sanctorum hominum non solitariorum conjugumque exempla, et monachorum atque eremitarum peccata testantur.' Bibl. Gr. ix. 5.

The Greek philosophers had a particular dress, and affected to appear rough, mean, and dirty, for which they were sometimes insulted in the streets by boys and by the populace; and the cynics, very prudently, were armed with a staff, to defend themselves from dogs and from the

rabble. The Christian monks imitated the old philosophers in their garb and appearance, and many of them seemed, in the opinion of those who loved them not, to have inherited the rags, the pride, and the contentious spirit of the former.

Some of them, out of mortification, would not catch or kill the vermin which devoured them; in which they far surpassed the Jews, who only spared them upon the sabbath day. 'Qui pediculum sabbato necat, tam reus est, quam qui camelum sabbato necaret:' says a rabbi.

Ammon, the father of the Ægyptian monks, in the days of his youth, being importuned by his relations to take a wife, married a young virgin, and on the wedding evening entertained her with a long harangue against the married state, and made her as fanatical as himself. The conclusion of which was, that they both eloped from their house, and fled to the desert, and there led a monastic life. Socrates, iv. 23.

We may compare this with the metamorphosis of Hippomenes and Atalanta, who on their wedding day were turned into lions:

> 'modo levia fulvæ
> Colla jubæ velant: digiti curvantur in ungues:
> Ex humeris armi fiunt: in pectora totum
> Pondus abit: summæ cauda verruntur arenæ.
> Iram vultus habet; pro verbis murmura reddunt:
> Pro thalamis celebrant silvas.'

Ovid. Met. x.

However, the monks, even in the earliest times, were not all of them such wonderful examples of mortification, as we learn from an unexceptionable witness, who was a fast friend and patron of monkery, from Athanasius. Writing to Dracontius, a monk, who had been chosen a bishop, and wanted much to decline the office, he says, 'When you are a bishop, you may fast and drink no wine: for we have known bishops who were fasters, and monks who were eaters; bishops who abstained from wine, and monks who drank it; bishops who wrought miracles, and monks who wrought none: many of the bishops have

kept themselves even from matrimony, and monks have been the fathers of children.' Epist. ad Dracont.

Tillemont, when he gives an account of this Epistle, omits the passage we have cited; and Du Pin, in his *Bibliotheque*, hath inserted it. Each had his reasons.

Jerom exhorts Rusticus, a monk, to live in a monastery, rather than to be a hermit in a solitary place. He sets forth the inconveniencies and bad consequences of this way of life. A hermit, says he, becomes proud, thinks himself a man of importance, forgets what he is, eats what he will, sleeps as much as he thinks fit, stands in awe of no person, is oftner rambling in the streets than at home in his cell. Not that I blame a solitary life, but I would have men first learn their spiritual exercises in a monastery. Du Pin.

They who have judged monasteries to be hurtful or useless, yet ever approved of universities, colleges, halls, schools, public libraries, hospitals, and places set apart for the relief of the miserable, the encouragement of literature, and the education of youth. 'Our Chelsea-college, as they say, was designed by King James I. for *Polemic divines*; and then, with a very small and easy alteration, it was made a receptacle of *maimed and disabled soldiers*.'

If the king's project had been put in execution, the house would probably have been a house of discord; and *Peace be within thy walls*, would have been a fruitless wish, and a prayer bestowed in vain upon it.—'Eo primum fine fundatum fuit (hoc Collegium) a Jacobo primo, ut illic theologi alerentur, quorum officium esset, ut publice oppugnarent novas in ecclesia hæreses.' Act. Erudit. MDCCIX. p. 114.

The *Baleares*, to teach their children the use of the sling, hung up their dinner, and did not let them eat it till they had fetched it down with a stone. In like manner, the fellows of this college were not to have been admitted to commons, till they had discovered a new heresy in the writings of some contemporary, and had confuted the doctrine, and worried the author.

Constantine held in the highest veneration those who addicted themselves to *divine philosophy*, as it was called

in those days; that is, to monkery: and the holy women who preserved a perpetual virginity, these he almost adored. So says Eusebius, who was carried away himself with the torrent, and overvalued this strange way of life. Vit. Const. iv. 26. 28. Demonstr. Ev. i. 8, 9. iii. p 129. To some of these saints might have been applied what Tertullian says of the Roman god Faunus Fatuus, 'Curari eum magis quam consecrari decebat.'

But of all the praisers of virginity, Jerom seems to have performed his part the best, who calls Eustochium the nun *His Lady*, because she was the *spouse* of his *Lord*, and reminds the mother of this lady, that she had the honour to be *God's mother-in-law*, *Socrus Dei*. Epist. ad Eustoch. t. iv. P. 2. p. 27 et 36.

After all, since some of the antient monks seem to have been pious, honest, well-meaning, and sensible men, a doubt will arise, whether the writers of their lives have not sometimes misrepresented them, as using more rigour and self-maceration than they really exercised; and whether they have not ascribed to them some freaks and follies into which they never fell, as well as miracles which they never performed. The sayings and the actions of these solitary saints, collected by Tillemont, Fleury, and others, and inserted in various parts of their Ecclesiastical Histories, are sometimes noble and commendable, charitable, discreet, compassionate, and good-natured, but oftener trifling, frantic, absurd, and ridiculous, mixed with everlasting apparitions of devils, and with miracles of the most useless, fantastic, and improbable kind. So the whole is a strange medley of piety and folly, sense and nonsense.

Concerning the miracles wrought in the fourth and fifth centuries, this general observation may be made, that they were usually performed either to serve the cause of the Consubstantialists and to run down Arianism, as afterwards Nestorianism and Pelagianism, or to establish the adoration of saints and of reliques, or to represent a monastic life as the summit of human piety, the quintessence of perfection, and a service the most acceptable to heaven. One would wonder how the physicians did to live in those days, when this effusion of miracles seemed to have rendered

their art altogether unnecessary. They could have had no business, except amongst Pagans, Jews, Heretics, and Schismatics.

The Ægyptian monks, says Sozomen, preserved with great care the memory of the wonders wrought by their founders and fore-fathers; but they thought it proper to deliver them down from one to another by word of mouth, not by written records. Perhaps they were driven to this method by necessity, and because they could neither write nor read.

As a story never loses in telling, the wonders were daily augmented by this excellent contrivance, and the traditionary snow-ball, rolled about by the monks, licked up new materials, and made a considerable figure. Πολλὰ δὲ καὶ θεσπέσια ἐπ' αὐτῷ συμβέβηκεν, ἃ μάλιστα τοῖς κατ' Αἴγυπτον μοναχοῖς ἠκρίβωται, περὶ πολλοῦ ποιουμένοις, διαδοχῇ παραδόσεως ΑΓΡΑΦΟΥ ἐπιμελῶς ἀπομνημονεύειν τὰς τῶν παλαιοτέρων ἀσκητῶν ἀρετάς. 'Multa porro per eum (Ammonem) mirabilia contigerunt, quæ ab Ægypti monachis studiose notata sunt: quippe qui magni æstimant, veterum monarchorum virtutes continua successione sibi a majoribus traditas accurate commemorare.' i. 14.

Valesius hath not expressed the sense altogether so clearly as he ought to have done.

The Ægyptians were by nature disposed to bear austerities and mortifications, and fit to become monks. 'Homines autem Ægyptii plerique subfusculi sunt, et atrati,—gracilenti, et aridi, ad singulos motus excandescentes, controversi et reposcones acerrimi. Erubescit apud eos, si quis non inficiando tributa plurimas in corpore vibices ostendat. Et nulla tormentorum vis inveniri adhuc potuit, quæ obdurato illius tractus latroni invito elicere potuit, ut nomen proprium dicat.' Amm. Marcell. xxii. 16. Αἰγυπτίους φασὶ δεινῶς ἐγκαρτερεῖν ταῖς βασάνοις, καὶ ὅτι θᾶττον τεθνήξεται ἀνὴρ Αἰγύπτιος στρεβλούμενος ἢ τ' ἀληθὲς ὁμολογήσει. Ælian Var. Hist. vii. 18.

The emperor Valens made a law to compel the monks to serve civil offices, and, as some say, to serve in the army, which was no bad scheme. See Cod. Theod. l. xii. tit. i. p. 409. and Gothofred's Notes, and Tillemont H. E. viii. 608. 808.

'Quidam ignaviæ sectatores, desertis civitatum muneribus, captant solitudines ac secreta, et specie religionis cum cœtibus Monazontôn congregantur. Hos igitur atque hujusmodi, intra Ægyptum deprehensos, per Comitem Orientis, erui e latebris consultâ præceptione mandavimus, atque ad munia patriarum subeunda revocari.'—Cod. Th. The same law is to be found in Justinian's Code. Many of these monks, as it appears from ecclesiastical history, had such a martial spirit, and were so addicted to fighting, that they were fitter for the camp than for the cloister.

But it is not probable that Valens would have done the Ægyptian monks so much honour as to list them for soldiers, or that they had the legal qualifications requisite for it. He compelled them 'militare,' as Orosius and others say; but in those days the words 'militia' and 'militare' were used for all kinds of public offices, civil as well as military.

In the fourth century, the number of the monks and nuns of Ægypt alone amounted to more than ninety-six thousand. Fleury H. E. v. p. 30.

One reason of this multiplication of monks was, that they were a collection of all sorts of people, of beggars, fugitives, vagabonds, slaves, day-labourers, peasants, mechanics of the lowest sort, thieves, and highwaymen, inured to stripes, poverty, hunger, and hardships, so that a monastic life, such as it was, was preferable to that which they had led; and by becoming monks, they became gentlemen, and a sort of saints. We find from Augustin, that several of them refused to labour with their hands, and expected to be maintained in laziness, pretending that the good instruction which they imparted, and the good example which they set, deserved such a recompence; for which this father reprimands them. 2. Retract. c. 21.

The monks in all times had their friends and their foes: the first were generally of the clergy, and the second of the laity.

In the fourth century, the people of Rome for the most part (as we learn from Jerom) abhorred the monks who repaired thither from the East, as beggarly impostors, and hungry Greeks, who seduced ladies of fortunes and quality,

and often ruined their health by persuading them to practise rigid mortifications and austerities.

When Jerom departed from Rome, A. D. 385. Paula, with her daughter Eustochium, followed him. She was an illustrious lady, of the family of the *Gracchi* and the *Cornelii*. Before she set out, she divided her effects amongst her children, and then went to the haven, accompanied by her young, afflicted, weeping family, her brother, her children, and her kindred. 'Parvus Toxotius,' says Jerom, 'supplices manus tendebat in litore. Rufina jam nubilis, ut suas expectaret nuptias, tacitis fletibus obsecrabat.' But Paula, like another Regulus[f], brake through all these dear obstacles. She went to Cyprus, to kiss the feet of Epiphanius; thence to Antioch to visit Paulinus, and thence I know not whither.

What a folly for a grave matron to leave her family, out of devotion, and transformed into a religious gypsy, to roam about by sea and land from place to place, to visit monks and ecclesiastics! and what a still greater indiscretion in Jerom, to countenance and encourage such things! The laics in those days had just cause to dislike the monks, who put such superstitious fancies into the heads of their mothers, sisters, wives, and daughters, and taught them to throw away their time, and their money too; for these travelling ladies used to carry alms and oblations with them, to be distributed as the directors of their conscience should advise.

Homer was a much better preacher upon this subject, than the Fathers of the fourth and following centuries:

> [g] Ἀλλ' εἰς οἶκον ἰοῦσα τὰ σαυτῆς ἔργα κόμιζε,
> Ἱστόν τ' ἠλακάτην τε, καὶ ἀμφιπόλοισι κέλευε
> Ἔργον ἐποίχεσθαι.
>
> Il. Z.

Melania, the younger, had the same kind of zeal, and

> [f] Fertur pudicæ conjugis osculum,
> Parvosque natos, ut capitis minor,
> Ab se removisse, et virilem
> Torvus humi posuisse vultum.

> [g] No more—but hasten to thy tasks at home,
> There guide the spindle, and direct the loom.

was much admired for it. 'Piniano juncta erat, juveni nobilissimo, quem duorum filiorum patrem fecerat. '*Tantum eam cœpit odium matrimonii, ut dixerit marito suo Piniano, filio Severi, qui erat ex præfectis, si volueris quidem habitare mecum ut ratio dictat, te dominum agnosco. Sin autem hoc tibi grave videtur, utpote juveni, res omnes meas tibi habe, et solum sine me esse corpore liberam. Deus postea misertus adolescentis, ei zelum pietatis immisit. Cum ergo nupsisset viro, tredecim annos nata, septem vero cum eo vixisset, vigesimo ætatis suæ anno mundo renunciat.* Pallad. Laus. Omnia sua serica integumenta dedit altaribus, parteque prædiorum longe maximâ distractâ, collectam pecuniam in Palæstinam, Ægyptum, aliasque regiones pauperibus monachisque distribuendam misit.' S. Basnage Ann. iii. 228. This was A. D. 403.

Ambrose was one of the violent declaimers in favour of virginity, and in a treatise on that subject he exhorts girls to enter into nunneries, though against the will of their parents; which was highly indiscreet, to say no more, and which gave great offence to many Christians, even in those days. De Virgin. See Barbeyrac. Du Pin. t. ii. p. 246.

CONSTANTINE had a great desire to accomplish two very laudable designs; the first was to propagate Christianity, and to convert unbelievers; the other was to reunite Christians, and to compose their differences. In the first attempt he succeeded in some measure; but along with those who were sincere in their profession, there came a multitude of hypocrites and nominal Christians: the latter project he soon found to be impracticable.

In the persecution A. D. 303. Christians were required to give up their sacred books. They who complied were called 'Traditores.' Mensurius, bishop of Carthage, was suspected of this fault; for which, and for other reasons, Donatus and his partisans refused to hold communion with him; and thus began the schism of the Donatists, which continued three hundred years, and overspread the pro-

vinces of Afric. Constantine took fruitless pains to settle this affair by councils and hearings; and finding the Donatists extremely refractory, he was provoked to use rough methods, and to banish their ringleaders; but afterwards he recalled them, and gave them up, as he said, like incorrigible fools, to their own madness.

Those schismatics who wrangle in good earnest about trifles, have an incurable understanding, and are unpersuadeable, and would fall out with themselves, if they had none else to oppose.

About the same time brake out the Arian controversy, which made more noise, and did more mischief. It was the occasion of innumerable lies, slanders, forgeries, pretended miracles, persecutions, banishments, seditions, and murders, of many false and partial histories, and of a multitude of councils, which produced only confusion and discord. An evil dæmon, says Eusebius, who envied the peace and prosperity of the church set us at variance.

> 'At sæva e speculis tempus Dea nacta nocendi
> Ardua tecta petit stabuli; et de culmine summo
> *Pastorale* canit *signum*, cornuque recurvo
> Tartaream intendit vocem: qua protenus omne
> Contremuit nemus, et silvæ intonuere profundæ.
> Audiit et Triviæ longe lacus, audiit amnis
> Sulfurea Nar albus aqua, fontesque Velini:
> Et trepidæ matres pressere ad pectora natos[h].'

Here also Constantine laboured in vain to bring things to an accommodation: the most probable way to effect it was not put in execution.

Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, and Arius, who was a presbyter in his diocese[i], disputed together about the nature of Christ; and the bishop being displeased at the notions of Arius, and finding that they were adopted by other persons, 'was very angry,' says Socrates, πρὸς ὀργὴν ἐξάπτεται.

[h] Virg. Æn. vii. 511.

[i] Si ulla pars est Theologiæ, in qua facile est aut errare aut accusari, est illa de Trinitate. Grotius.

He commanded Arius to come over to his sentiments, and to quit his own: as if a man could change his opinions as easily as he can change his coat! τὸν Ἄρειον ὁμοίως φρονεῖν ἐκέλευσε. Soz.

He then called a council of war, consisting of near a hundred bishops, and deposed, excommunicated, and anathematized Arius, and with him several ecclesiastics, two of whom were bishops.

> 'Ille dies primus leti primusque malorum
> Caussa fuit.'

The Benedictin editors of Athanasius tell us that Alexander was as mild as a lamb, 'vir mitis et pacis amans.' Others will think, perhaps, that he and his assessors were too expeditious in passing sentence, and ready to turn a brother out of doors without much ceremony.

> 'Collige sarcinulas, exclamat Præsul, et exi
> Ocius, et propera.'

Alexander then wrote a circular letter to all bishops, in which he represents Arius and his partisans as heretics, apostates, blasphemers, enemies of God, full of impudence and impiety, forerunners of Antichrist, imitators of Judas, and men whom it was not lawful to salute, or to bid God speed.

Yet Sozomen acknowledges that they were learned men, and, in all appearance, good men. 'Cum igitur Alexander multos sanctioris vitæ specie venerabiles, et dicendi arte pollentes Arianis favere animadverteret, ac præcipue Eusebium, qui tunc temporis Nicomediensem ecclesiam gubernabat, virum doctissimum, magnæque in palatio auctoritatis, cunctis ubique episcopis scripsit, ne cum illis communicarent.' Soz. i. 15. 'At vero Eusebius, et alii quidam Orientalium partium episcopi, qui tum doctrinæ tum sanctitatis causa per id tempus celeberrimi habebantur.'—Idem, iii. 18.

Theodoret himself says of Basilius Ancyranus and Eustathius Sebastenus, who were Semiarian bishops; 'Porro ambo familiares erant imperatori (Constantio) et ob eximiam vitæ sanctimoniam summa apud eum auctoritate et fiducia pollebant.' ii. 23.

There is no reason to doubt of the probity and sincerity of those who opposed Alexander and the Nicene Fathers; for what did they get by it, besides obloquy and banishment? Many good men were engaged on both sides of the controversy: So it was in the fourth century, and so it hath been ever since.

In the same Epistle, Alexander is very severe upon Eusebius of Nicomedia, who afterwards was the head of the Arian party.

In defence of the divinity and eternity of the Son, he uses arguments which are not all of them conclusive, and brings texts of Scripture of which some are, and others are not to the purpose. 'To prove the eternity of the Λόγος, he cites Psalm xlv. 1. *My heart is enditing a good matter.* In the Greek, Ἐξερεύξατο ἡ καρδία μου λόγον ἀγαθόν. To this he adds another proof, which shows that he was a passable Cabbalist: *Solomon*, says he, *declares* Prov. xxx. 19. *that it is impossible to find out the way of a serpent upon a rock; which rock, as St. Paul tells us, is Christ.* How hardened and perverse must those men have been, who could withstand such evidence!'

He declares that the Son is from all eternity, immutable, and perfectly like the Father in all things, excepting that he is not 'unbegotten,' or 'self-existing;' that upon this account the Father is 'greater than the Son,' and that the Son is of a 'middle nature' between the First Cause of all things, and the creatures which from a state of non-existence were called into being—*μόνῳ τῷ ἀγεννήτῳ λειπόμενον ἐκείνου—ὡς αὐτὸς ἐπαίδευσεν ὁ Κύριος· ὁ Πατήρ μου, λέγων, μείζων μοῦ ἐστίν*·—'hoc solo inferiorem Patre, quod ingenitus non est—sicut ipse Dominus docuit, cum ait, Pater major me est,' &c. And again:—*μακρὸν ἂν εἴη μεταξὺ Πατρὸς ἀγεννήτου καὶ τῶν κτισθέντων ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων —ὧν μεσιτεύουσα ΦΥΣΙΣ μονογενὴς, δι' ἧς τὰ ὅλα ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐποίησεν ὁ Πατὴρ τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου, ἡ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ὄντος Πατρὸς γεγέννηται*·—'multum interest inter Patrem ingenitum et res ab illo creatas ex nihilo.—Inter quæ duo medium obtinens unigenita natura Dei Verbi, per quam Pater universa condidit ex nihilo, ex ipso vero Patre progenita est.' Apud Theodoret. i. p. 17.

'Benigne intelligendum est quod ait Alexander,' says Valesius. It is very well observed; for, without *benignity* and *grains of allowance*, Alexander himself will not be much better than the Semiarians.

'Sed vos, Trojugenæ, vobis ignoscitis.'—

Therefore Valesius, and several besides him, *interpret* the words of Alexander, so as to express their own *scholastic* language, and say that φύσις means *personality*, considered abstractedly from *entity*. See Le Clerc, Art. Crit. vol. i. p. 293, &c.

The difference between Alexander and the Semiarians seems not to have been great. Yet Pachomius, the monk, had a revelation, and a voice from heaven, which directed him to follow the doctrine of Alexander. 'Such was the testimony which God gave to the pure and orthodox faith of this holy prelate, who was soon to be attacked by the calumnies of the Arians.' Tillemont H. E. vi. 216. If this be true, a man may be orthodox, without coming fully up to that standard of orthodoxy which was fixed in later ages. Monsieur Jurieu, whose zeal against heresy is well known, assures us that the fundamental articles of Christianity were not understood by the Fathers of the three first centuries; that the true system began to be modelled into some shape by the Nicene bishops, and was afterwards immensely improved and beautified by the following synods and councils; that is, by the *Jurieus* of the fourth and fifth centuries. Thus did this warm and imprudent writer make concessions as large and liberal as his adversaries could desire, and deliver himself up to be buffeted by the Socinians, whom he had treated as the vilest of all heretics.

Philostorgius says, that one Alexander Baucalis was the incendiary who stirred up the unhappy quarrel between Alexander and Arius. He also tells us that Alexander of Alexandria owed his bishopric to Arius, who might have been chosen, but declined it, and preferred Alexander to himself: he also mentions some things which are not to the honour of Athanasius. Philostorgius, indeed, was an Arian; but there is no good reason why we should follow

the example of modern ecclesiastical historians, and believe every thing that the Homoousians say concerning the Arians, and nothing that the Arians say concerning the Homoousians. It is best to be diffident, and not to trust overmuch to the relations of either party.

Eusebius of Nicomedia, and Eusebius the historian, endeavoured to pacify Alexander, and to persuade him to make up the quarrel; and Constantine sent a letter by the illustrious Hosius of Corduba, to Alexander and Arius, in which he reprimanded them both for disturbing the church with their insignificant disputes ὑπὲρ μικρῶν καὶ λίαν ἐλαχίστων, 'de rebus parvis atque levissimis,' and exhorted them to mutual forbearance and forgiveness. Socrates commends this letter, and calls the emperor's sentiments wise and prudent. Τοιαῦτα μὲν οὖν θαυμαστὰ καὶ σοφίας μεστὰ παρήνει ἡ τοῦ βασιλέως ἐπιστολή.—i. 8. which Valesius renders, 'Et hæc quidem imperator admirabili sapientia *præditus* per literas suadebat.' He should have said 'prædita,' or 'plena;' but he seems, for certain good reasons, to have had a mind to translate it wrong. Eusebius also hath published and praised this Epistle. Tillemont, Baronius, and many others, are highly offended at it, and suppose that the emperor, when he wrote it, had some evil counsellor at his elbow, either Satan, or Eusebius.

But the affair was gone too far to be thus composed, and Socrates represents both sides as equally contentious and refractory.

To settle this and other points, the Nicene council was summoned, consisting of about *three hundred and eighteen* bishops,—a *mystical* number[k], on which many profound remarks have been made.

The first thing that they did was to quarrel, and to express their resentments, and to present accusations to the emperor against one another. So say Socrates, Sozomen, Rufinus. Theodoret favours his brethren in this affair, and seems to throw the fault upon the laity. 'Rufinus quidem ait episcopos variis de causis inter se jurgantes libel-

[k] See Barnabas, c. ix. p. 28. and his commentators.

los criminationum adversus collegas Constantino obtulisse. Theodoritus vero libellos illos porrectos fuisse dicit a laicis, qui episcopos variis de causis accusabant.' Valesius ad Theod. i. 11. But the whole story, as it is related by them all, and even by Theodoret, shows that the bishops accused one another.

The emperor burnt all their libels, and exhorted them to peace and unity; so that if they had not been restrained by his authority, and by fear and respect, they would probably have spent their time in altercations. Socrates, i. 8.

'In ea sententia fuit Socrates,' says bishop Bull, 'ut crederet concilio episcoporum vere universali semper adesse Spiritus Sancti gratiam illuminatricem, quæ eos, utcunque rudes et imperitos (quod tamen Sabinus de patribus Nicenis falso affirmaverat) ab errore saltem in necessariis fidei articulis immunes custodiret.' Def. Fid. Nic. See Socrates i. p. 31.

Thus the *infallibility* of general councils is established. But where, I pray, is this written? and in what part of the New Testament shall we find this important doctrine?

What constitutes a general council? and how shall we know when it is 'vere universale?' For this, it seems, is a necessary requisite to draw down infallibility upon it.

Have bishops alone a right to vote in a general council? Why are presbyters excluded, &c.? Were even all the Christian bishops invited to the Nicene council? Were the Novatian bishops admitted there? No, says Valesius; they deserved to be shut out, as being schismatics. It may be so; but they were accounted orthodox in points of doctrine, and they had also a plausible claim to admittance, if they wrought miracles. Socrates tells us that some of them had these extraordinary gifts, and their miracles are as probable as those of Antony, of Hilarion, of Symeon, and of other monks. Four hundred bishops met together at Ariminum: did they constitute a general council? No; it was an Arian council, and therefore it must not be called 'concilium,' but 'conciliabulum.' Thus the question concerning *universality* is somewhat embarrassed. But let

us proceed to something that is not embarrassed, and that is sufficiently plain.

Let us imagine, then, a council called by a Christian emperor, by a Constantine, a Constantius, a Theodosius, a Justinian, and three or four or five hundred prelates assembled together from all quarters, to decide a theological debate.

Let us consider a little by what various motives these various men may be influenced, as by reverence to the emperor, or to his counsellors and favourites, his slaves and eunuchs; by the fear of offending some great prelate, as a bishop of Rome or of Alexandria, who had it in his power to insult, vex, and plague all the bishops within and without his jurisdiction; by the dread of passing for heretics, and of being calumniated, reviled, hated, anathematized, excommunicated, imprisoned, banished, fined, beggared, starved if they refused to submit; by compliance with some active, leading, and imperious spirits, by a deference to the majority, by a love of dictating and domineering, of applause and respect, by vanity and ambition, by a total ignorance of the question in debate, or a total indifference about it, by private friendships, by enmity and resentment, by old prejudices, by hopes of gain, by an indolent disposition, by good nature, by the fatigue of attending, and a desire to be at home, by the love of peace and quiet, and a hatred of contention, &c.

Whosoever takes these things into due consideration will not be disposed to pay a blind deference to the authority of general councils, and will rather be inclined to judge that 'the council held by the apostles at Jerusalem was the first and the last in which the Holy Spirit may be affirmed to have presided.'

Thus far we may safely go, and submit to an apostolical synod: but if once we proceed one step beyond this, we go we know not whither. If we admit the infallibility of one general council, why not of another? and where shall we stop? At the first Nicene council, A. D. 325, or at the second Nicene council, A. D. 787? 'They who disclaim private judgment, and believe the infallibility of the church, act consistently in holding the infallibility of coun-

cils; but they who take their faith from the Scriptures, and not from the church, should be careful not to require nor to yield too much regard to such assemblies, how numerous soever. Numbers, in this case, go for little; and to them the old proverb may be applied;

'Est turba *semper* argumentum pessimi.'

I would have said 'sæpe,' but the verse will not admit it.

If even the Nicene council hath small pretensions to infallibility, the subsequent general councils, as that of Constantinople, and that of Ephesus, have still less pretensions, as bishop Bull must have known, and as every one knows who is at all acquainted with their history. A council of gladiators held in an amphitheatre would be as venerable as that of the Constantinopolitan Fathers, if Gregory Nazianzen may be believed. The testimony of this pious and learned Father is very troublesome to the admirers of such assemblies, and they are willing to suppose that it was the effect of peevishness, and that old age and ill usage had soured his temper in some degree.

What would the good man have said if he had lived to see the general council of Ephesus, which was far worse than any thing that his eyes had ever beheld? He would have wished himself at the ends of the earth, to be rid of such company: and as he was a poet, he would have made verses upon the occasion, after the manner of

'Pone me pigris ubi nulla campis
Arbor æstiva recreatur aura;
Quod latus mundi nebulæ malusque
Jupiter urget:
Pone sub curru nimium propinqui
Solis in terra domibus negata——'

If such councils made righteous decrees, it must have been by strange good luck.

Several writers of the fourth and following centuries have indeed spoken of the Nicene Fathers as of 'inspired men;' but we must remember that the epithets θεόπνευστος and θεοφόρος, like other complimenting titles, were extremely cheap in those days.

Eusebius and several of the antients commend the Nicene bishops in general: Sabinus, bishop of Heraclea, and of the sect of the Macedonians, called them ignorant and illiterate men, in his collection of councils, which is lost; for which Socrates reprimands him, and bishop Bull censures him with great vehemence.

In the Nicene council there were undoubtedly not a few learned, pious, and virtuous prelates, and holy confessors; and some worthy persons, though not so many, in some of the subsequent general councils; but in such assemblies, the best and the most moderate men seldom have the ascendant, and they are often led or driven by others who are far inferior to them in good qualities.

A general council, as we are told, will at least be secured from erring in fundamentals.

But, by this way of reasoning, the number of *fundamentals* will be increased beyond measure and without end, and *metaphysical terms of art* will be accounted *fundamental doctrines*, as if the very existence of Christianity could depend upon words not used by the Holy Spirit, unknown to the sacred writers, not to be found in the creeds of the three first centuries, of which different interpretations were given when they were first established, and have been given ever since, and which common people most certainly do not and cannot understand: but they are secured, it seems, by that sort of faith without knowledge, which the church of Rome recommends, and which is called by some 'Fides carbonaria.'

At the Nicene council, Eusebius proposed a creed, in which he avoided the word ὁμοούσιος, and anathematized 'every impious heresy,' without specifying any: but his advice was not followed, ὁμοούσιος was inserted, and the Arian doctrines were anathematized.

Disputes, as we may well suppose, ensued amongst the bishops, concerning the meaning and the consequences of the word ὁμοούσιος. Eusebius assented to it, and declared in what sense he understood it. His sense of 'consubstantial' was, that 'the Son of God was not like created beings, but received his existence and his perfections from the Father, in a different and in an ineffable manner.' Thus he took leave to interpret for himself the ὁμοούσιος; and the

council seems to have given him permission so to do, or at least not to have passed any sort of censure upon him, though they understood more to be contained in that word. If that were really the case, as I think it was, Eusebius did not deceive the council.

Others gave other senses to it, and the debate, says Socrates, was like a battle fought in the dark. — ἡ τοῦ ὁμοουσίου λέξις τινὰς διετάραττε· περὶ ἣν κατατριβόμενοι καὶ ἀκριβολογούμενοι τὸν κατ' ἀλλήλων πόλεμον ἤγειραν· νυκτομαχίας τε οὐδὲν ἀπεῖχε τὰ γινόμενα. οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀλλήλους ἐφαίνοντο νοοῦντες, ἀφ' ὧν ἀλλήλους βλασφημεῖν ὑπελάμβανον.— 'vox *Consubstantialis* quorundam animos conturbabat; quam illi diu multumque versantes, et scrupulosius examinantes, intestinum inter se bellum excitaverunt. Eaque res nocturnæ pugnæ haudquaquam dissimilis erat: neque enim utrique satis intelligere videbantur, cur sese invicem calumniis appetere instituissent.'— i. 23. et Soz. ii. 18.

Socrates was a Consubstantialist, so far as to believe even that miracles were wrought by the monks in favour of that doctrine; and yet, upon examining the Epistles written on the controversy by bishops of each party, he could not help concluding that they disputed about words of which they had no ideas, and charged one another with consequences and inferences which neither side would own.

The council of Antioch, which consisted of Consubstantialists, wrote an Epistle to the emperor Jovian, and explain their doctrine in the following manner: Ἀναφέρομεν τῇ σῇ εὐλαβείᾳ, ὅτι τῆς ἁγίας συνόδου τῆς ἐν Νικαίᾳ πάλαι πρότερον συγκροτηθείσης τὴν πίστιν καὶ ἀποδεχόμεθα, καὶ κατέχομεν. ὁπότε καὶ τὸ δοκοῦν ἐν αὐτῇ τισὶ ξένον ὄνομα, τὸ τοῦ Ὁμοουσίου φαμὲν, ἀσφαλοῦς τετύχηκε παρὰ τοῖς πατράσιν ἑρμηνείας, σημαινούσης ὅτι ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρὸς ὁ Υἱὸς ἐγεννήθη, καὶ ὅτι ὅμοιος κατ' οὐσίαν τῷ Πατρί. οὔτε δὲ ὡς πάθους τινὸς περὶ τὴν ἄῤῥητον γέννησιν ἐπινοουμένου, οὔτε κατὰ τινα χρῆσιν Ἑλληνικὴν λαμβάνεται τὸ ὄνομα τῆς οὐσίας· ὡς ἀνατροπὴν δὲ τοῦ ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων περὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἀσεβῶς τολμηθέντος Ἀρείῳ. 'Religioni tuæ significamus, nos fidem eorum qui Nicææ olim congregati sunt, et probare et retinere. Etenim vocabulum in ea synodo positum, quod

quibusdam novum atque insolens videtur, *Consubstantialis* videlicet, id cautissimam interpretationem a Patribus accepit; ut scilicet Filius ex substantia Patris genitus, et quoad substantiam Patri similis esse intelligatur. Non quo perpessio quædam in illa inenarrabili generatione cogitetur, *aut nomen substantiæ juxta Gentilium usum et consuetudinem accipiatur*: sed ut evertatur id quod Arius ausus erat asserere, Filium ex nihilo extitisse.' Apud Sozom. vi. 4.

This is interpreting 'obscurum per obscurius;' and if any one can tell what these Lycophrons meant by οὐσία, he must be very sagacious. All that we can learn from their Epistle is, that the word οὐσία, being used by Christian divines, had lost its Pagan signification, and had not acquired a new one.

Si aurem præbeamus viris, quorum aliaquin auctoritatem spernere nequaquam possumus, de Synodis *veteribus loquentibus, nobis magnifica oratione describent* ἁγίας καὶ οἰκουμενικὰς συνόδους θεοφόρων πατέρων, συναθροισθείσας ἐπὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ μεγάλου βασιλέως, καὶ ἰσαποστόλου. Sanctos et œcumenicos cœtus adflatorum divinitus patrum, congregatos in regno magni regis et apostolis æquiparandi. *Quis, auditis his et similibus verbis, religioso quodam horrore et corpore et animo non contremiscat, ac paratus non sit oracula ejusmodi cœtûs avidis auribus excipere, haud aliter ac si cœlo ipso emitterentur? Verùm hæc est (quis crederet?) abstracta notio synodorum, quæ in inconspicua idearum republica coguntur; non imago earum, quæ inter miseros mortales olim congregatæ fuere. Reges ignari (non legent hæc Mohammedani, nec Ethnici, sed ii quorum scire interest, quo fiet ut verum aperte proloquar) reges, inquam, ignari, nec inter bonos principes numerandi, convocarunt Græculos, qui linguæ acuendæ per totam vitam operam dederant, rerum ipsarum ignaros, contendendi studiosos, perpetuis rixis inter se divisos; et bardos aliquot homines ex occidente, rudiores quidem illos, sed non meliores; iique post pudendas contentiones, obscurissima quædam dogmata, verbis sæpe parum aptis, auctoritate sua firmant; quæ stupidi populi sine examine adorent, quasi divinitus accepta. Non ficta me loqui norunt qui*

synodorum historias legerunt; nec certe vanus erat Gregorius Nazianzenus, qui dixit:

Οὐδέ τί που συνόδοισιν ὁμόφρονος ἔσσομ' ἔγωγε
Χηνῶν ἢ γεράνων ἄκριτα μαρναμένων.
Ἔνθ' ἔρις, ἔνθα μόθος τε, καὶ αἴσχεα κρυπτὰ πάροιθεν,
Εἰς ἕνα δυσμενέων χῶρον ἀγειρόμενα.

Nunquam ego sedebo in synodis anserum aut gruum temere pugnantium. Illic contentio, illic rixa, et probra antea latentia sævorum hominum in unum locum collecta.

Visne aliam notionem abstractam? Lege quæ de ecclesia repræsentativa, *ut solet vocari, a plurimis olim et nuper scripta sunt; illâ nihil sanctius, nihil doctius, nihil amantius veri excogitari potest. Sed cave ne abstractæ notioni similem ullam in rerum natura quæras, nisi frustra esse velis. Si rem in qua reperiri oporteret, quod tantis laudibus ornatur, inspicias, delabêris forte ad opinionem Gasparis Scioppii, insignis grammatici, qui* ecclesiam repræsentativam *definiebat*, mandram, sive gregem, aut multitudinem jumentorum, sive asinorum; *et benigne atque amice locutum esse judicabis, quod* ferarum *non dixerit. Nec aliter de iis sensit Josephus Scaliger, cujus est hoc insigne judicium, in* Scaligeranis: Christianis Orientalibus Græcis, Syris, hodie nihil pejus; et olim episcopi Græci fuerunt nequissimi et superbissimi. Eorum concilia fuerunt meræ conspirationes. Latina ecclesia longe honestius se gessit, quamvis intus multa et clam pessime fecerint. Clericus Art. Crit. i. p. 430.

This description of *General Councils* gave offence to many persons, whose reverence for these assemblies was at least as great as Le Clerc's and Scaliger's disregard. But thus much is certain, that by paying little deference to general councils, few inconveniences arise, compared with those which inevitably follow a blind and tame submission, in points of faith, to human decisions, and to *public wisdom*, as some of our controversial doctors have loved to call it, which may be *public folly*.

Public wisdom is a mere *Proteus*, and, not to consider

it in Pagan or Mohammedan countries, amongst the Jews it once was the wisdom of Ahab and Jezebel, and afterwards of Annas and Caiaphas; and in Christian regions it hath appeared in a hundred shapes. It sets out with a great show of religion: it begins with 'the Gospel according to St. Matthew;' and it often ends in 'the Gospel according to Mr. Hobbes.'

Ecclesiastical government, in some form, is absolutely necessary, without which no discipline and order can be preserved, and no religious society can well subsist; and which none can be more willing to obey than I am: Yet, 'Call no man your Father upon earth; for one is your Father, who is in heaven. Neither be ye called Masters; for one is your Master, even Christ.'

'Deus dedit omnibus pro virili portione sapientiam;—nec quia nos illi temporibus antecesserunt, sapientia quoque antecesserunt. Quæ si omnibus æqualiter datur, occupari ab antecedentibus non potest.—Sapientiam sibi adimunt, qui sine ullo judicio inventa majorum probant, et ab aliis pecudum more ducuntur. Sed hoc eos fallit, quod majorum nomine posito, non putant fieri posse ut aut ipsi plus sapiant, quia minores vocantur, aut illi desipuerint, quia majores nominantur.' Lactantius Div. Inst. ii. 7.

Valesius is a strenuous defender of the sacred authority of general councils. 'Quid per spiritualem legem [τῇ πνευματικῇ νομοθεσίᾳ] Theodoritus intelligat, obscurum est. Ego Nicænæ fidei symbolum intelligi puto, quo definitum est, Filium Patri consubstantialem esse. *Decreta enim synodorum, leges sunt Spiritus Sancti.* Nota sunt verba apostolorum quæ leguntur in Actibus, cap. xv. *Visum est enim Spiritui Sancto et nobis,*' &c. Ad Theodor. v. 13.

Valesius was obliged to maintain such principles, or to give up his religion; and every protestant who admits these principles ought by all means to admit the conclusion, and to go over to the church of Rome.

The fourth general council, of Chalcedon, A. D. 451. was also divinely inspired and infallible, as we learn from no less a voucher than *Symeon Stylites.*—διὸ κἀγὼ—ἐγνώρισα τὴν ἐμὴν πρόθεσιν, τὴν περὶ τὴν πίστιν τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων τῶν ἐν Καλχηδόνι συνελθόντων ἑξακοσίων τριάκοντα,

ἐμμένων καὶ ὑποστηριζόμενος ὑπ' αὐτῆς τῆς ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος φανερωθείσης. εἰ γὰρ μεταξὺ δύο ἢ τριῶν συνελθόντων διὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, πάρεστιν ὁ Σωτὴρ, πῶς μεταξὺ τοσούτων καὶ τηλικούτων ἁγίων πατέρων ἐνεχώρει, εἰ μὴ ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς μετ' αὐτῶν τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα; Quapropter ego—animi mei sententiam significavi, de fide sexcentorum triginta sanctorum patrum qui Chalcedone congregati sunt, persistens et fundatus in ea fide quæ a Spiritu Sancto revelata est. Etenim si Servator noster, ubi duo tresve in nomine ipsius congregati sunt, adest in medio illorum, quomodo fieri posset inter tot et tantos sanctos patres, ut Spiritus Sanctus cum illis non esset?'

Thus saith Symeon, 'apud Evagrium,' ii. 10. The honest monk talks like an inhabitant of the *middle region*, who lived upon *his pillar*, and knew little of what passed below. The patrons of this doctrine are able to produce a large number of Symeons, and of antient and modern teachers, who all agree in voting for the inspiration of synods; for it is a much easier thing to find *monks* than *reasons*; but the former without the latter will be of small service to them.

After all, it hath happened sometimes that one council hath contradicted another; and this creates a terrible difficulty, out of which neither Valesius nor Symeon himself can extricate us.

We have a more certain rule by which we may judge of councils,—a rule given us by our Master; 'By their fruits ye shall know them.' We need only survey their acts and monuments, their behaviour, doctrines, decrees, and censures, and compare them impartially with the morality, the simplicity, the prudence, the charity, and the piety of the Gospel. By this method we may form a tolerable idea of them, though amongst the Fathers of those centuries there was no *Father Paul* to do them justice, and to give us an account of their proceedings.

'Athanasius was made bishop, and successor to Alexander, because whilst he was deacon he had strenuously opposed Arius. Philostorgius relates many things of him not at all to his credit, which perhaps are not more to be received than the reports of the Homoousians concerning

Arius, nor yet more to be rejected, since prejudice and partiality were very prevalent on both sides.

'A. D. 330. The Nicene council by its determinations
A. D. 325. could not appease the dissensions. Great were the contests and the quarrels in Ægypt between the Arians and the Athanasians, and the Homoousian writers so represent the affair, as to favour the latter, and to condemn the former in all points.

'This year a tumult was raised at Antioch on account of the controversy.

'A. D. 335. Athanasius was condemned by a council held at Tyre, for having obtained the see of Alexandria by unjustifiable methods, and for other and worse misdemeanours, if Philostorgius may be credited, ii. 11. This historian, though a favourer of the Arian cause, yet freely censures Arius where he thought him reprehensible, and therefore might be a fair relator of other points.

'In the following year Athanasius was accused again by the same bishops who had condemned him at Tyre, and who were now assembled at Constantinople, and the emperor Constantine banished him into Gaul.

'About this time died Arius, by a wonderful judgment of God, as his adversaries afterwards said. But quarrels ran so high in those days, that there is no confiding in the reports of either party.

'A. D. 341. Athanasius, who had been honourably recalled from banishment by Constantine the younger, was condemned and deposed by the council of Antioch[k], consisting of about a hundred bishops, of whom a third part were Arians, and Gregory[l] of Cappadocia was put in his place,

'Julius, bishop of Rome, called a council, and acquitted Athanasius, and condemned the council of Antioch.

'Athanasius then returned to Alexandria.

'Macedonius was appointed bishop of Constantinople, and Hermogenes the præfect endeavoured to put him in possession, and to drive out Paul; but Hermogenes was

[k] See the remarks of Pagi, in Socrates, p. 84. not. a.

[l] Who came in like a tyrant, and committed many outrages.

murdered by the Athanasian populace, who wanted to have Paul for their bishop.

'The Arians, in their council at Antioch, had made a creed, and left out the ὁμοούσιος. After this they proposed a new confession of faith, which was said to have been the creed of Lucian the martyr[m], who was of the same sentiments which were afterwards held by Arius, as Alexander of Alexandria and Philostorgius testify.

'In this creed the Arians, avoiding the word *Consubstantial*, call the Son ἄτρεπτόν τε καὶ ἀναλλοίωτον τῆς θεότητος, οὐσίας τε καὶ βουλῆς καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης ἀπαραλλακτον εἰκόνα, καὶ πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως· 'immutabilem et conversioni non obnoxium ad divinitatem quod attinet, essentiæ vero, consilii, et potentiæ Patris immutabilem imaginem, primogenitum omnis creaturæ'

'Valesius translates ἀπαραλλακτον 'nullatenus discrepantem;' but though the word is often to be found in that sense, it signifies also 'immutabilem.' This induces me to think that they had a mind to draw up a creed in expressions which might be approved by both parties[n], an expedient often practised in this controversy.

'A. D. 347. Constans called a council at Sardica. Three hundred and seventy bishops were assembled, and most of them being Homoousians, Athanasius was acquitted. But the Arian prelates, withdrawing themselves, met at Philippi, and there made contrary decrees, which also were called Sardicansian. Nor would Athanasius have been recalled to Alexandria, if Constantius, moved by the threatening letters of his brother Constans, and for the sake of peace, had not given his consent to it, two years after the council of Sardica.

[m] Lucian was highly honoured by the Arians, and some of the most celebrated bishops of that party, as Eusebius of Nicomedia, Maris, Theognis, Leontius, &c. are said to have been his disciples. Philostorgius relates that the body of this martyr was brought to Nicomedia by a dolphin, the very dolphin, I suppose, who carried Arion upon his back, and who had the same affection for saints as for musicians.

[n] This confession of faith is Catholic, says Du Pin, although the word 'Consubstantial' be not in it. B. E. ii. p. 325.

'A. D. 350.[o] A council was held at Sirmium, in which Photinus was condemned. The bishops who met there were almost all of them Arians[p], yet were their canons received like those of other councils.

'A. D. 357. Many Homoousians were banished, and amongst them Liberius, bishop of Rome, and other bishops. Liberius, after having remained two years in banishment, subscribed to the condemnation of Athanasius, and published a confession of faith, in which, leaving out the word ὁμοούσιος, he declared the Son to be like the Father in all things.

'At this time the Arians began to be distinguished and divided. Part of them were Homoiousians, and part Anomœans. The first said that the Son was altogether ὁμοιούσιος, of like substance with the Father; the second, that he was ἀνόμοιος, unlike, or different, or unequal. Such was the difference between the Arians, if we may trust to the accounts of antient writers.

'In the council of Ancyra, the Anomœans were condemned, and it was decreed that two councils should be called, one for the Eastern churches, at Seleucia, another for the Western, at Ariminum.

'A. D. 359. At Seleucia, the Homoiousians and the Anomœans contended: the latter were overpowered.

'Four hundred bishops were assembled at Ariminum, of whom about a fourth part were Arians; where, after much wrangling and many delays, most of them subscribed to a creed, in which it was only said that the Son of God was not a creature, like other creatures.

'A. D. 360. Macedonius, who was driven away from Constantinople, is said to have published his notions concerning the Holy Ghost. With the rest of the Arians, he denied the consubstantiality of the Son, and only said that he was like the Father; but he positively affirmed that the Holy Ghost was κτιστὸν 'created.' His successor was Eudoxius, an Anomœan, who had been bishop of Antioch, on whose removal great dissensions arose at Antioch. Some followed Eustathius, who had been deposed in the

[o] A. D. 351. Cave. See Socr. ii. 29. and the notes.

[p] Cave says, 'Semiarians.'

year 330. Others joined themselves to Meletius, who had been ordained by the favourers of Eudoxius, and who had deserted Arianism; whilst a third party, who were Arians, shunned them both, and had Euzoius for their bishop,

'A. D. 363. The Arians, the Semiarians, (so they called the Homoiousians,) and the Consubstantialists, were quarrelling and contending every where, particularly in the eastern parts, and the emperor Valens favoured and supported the Arians.

'Gregory and Basil, who had led a monastic life, left their retirement, to oppose the progress of Arianism.' Le Clerc, Compend. Hist.

A. D. 364. Apollinaris, bishop of Laodicea, a man much esteemed for learning and piety, gave rise to a new sect. He thought, perhaps, that, Christ being *one*, it was impossible that *two persons* could be so united in him as to make *one person*. Thence (as some say) he concluded, that in Christ the Λόγος supplied the place of a human soul. It is to be supposed that the Arians either were of the same opinion, or came into it and adopted it. Theodoret says, 'Simon, Basilides, Valentinus, Bardesanes, &c. acknowledged Jesus Christ to be God, but said that he was only man in appearance; the Arians held that the *Word* in Christ supplied the place of a soul. Apollinaris taught that the *Word* was united to a living body[n], but a body not animated with a reasonable soul; Photinus, Marcellus of Ancyra, and Paul of Samosata, said that Christ was a mere man.' Epist. 104.

This may suffice for a summary account of the Athanasian and Arian controversy, during the first forty years.

The Pagans who were by-standers in the times when this controversy was so warmly agitated, could not be much edified, or much disposed to embrace Christianity, when they saw its professors at such implacable variance. This made Ammianus Marcellinus say, that no wild beast was so cruel an enemy to man as most of the Christians were to each other. Julian, says he, knew their quarrelsome temper,

[n] Σῶμα ἔμψυχον· corpus præditum animâ sensitivâ.

'nullas infestas hominibus bestias, ut sunt sibi ferales plerique Christianorum, expertus.' xxii. 5.

The Alexandrians, a people naturally satirists, jesters, and buffoons[o], and the most quarrelsome and seditious of all mankind, those I mean who were Pagans, were highly entertained with these debates, and made them the subject of constant ridicule and drollery in their theatres. Euseb. Vit. Const. ii. 61. They were doubtless of the same opinion with Shaftsbury and his facetious disciples, that 'Ridicule is the only test of truth.'

For an instance of their national temper and turn of mind, when king Agrippa came to Alexandria, A. D. 38. the Alexandrians, who hated him because he was a Jew, and envied him because he was a king, contrived to set up a rival against him. They took a poor mad-man, who used to run naked about the streets, and hung a mat over his shoulders by way of robe, and put a paper diadem on his head, and a cane in his hand. When they had thus equipped him, they set him up on a bench in the most conspicuous place in the city; some with sticks on their shoulders stood round him as his guards; others knelt down before him, bringing informations or complaints, or begging favours, whilst all the populace shouted, and called him Royal Master. Philo in Flacc. p. 970. ed. Par.

Elias Cretensis, in his Commentaries on Gregory Naz. p. 316. says that the Alexandrians 'Ethnicum quendam hominem insigniter impudicum, veste detracta, pudendisque nudatis, in antistitis solio collocarunt, tanquam si antistes aliquis foret. Ille vero doctoris larvam præ se ferens, in religionem Christianam invehebatur, comico eam risu exsibilans, et contrariam ei doctrinam proponens.'

He took this from Theodoret: 'Quendam ex suo numero notissimæ turpitudinis, qui una cum veste pudorem simul exuerat, nudum sicut natus erat, in ecclesiæ solio collocantes, concionatorem infamem adversus Christum sa-

[o] The Romans were fond of purchasing Alexandrian boys for slaves, because they were spritely, witty, and extremely impudent. See Statius Silv. ii. i. 72. and v. v. 66. and the commentators.

The poet Claudian was an Alexandrian, and his works are generally either panegyrics or satires; but he shines most in the latter, as appears from his two books against Eutropius.

lutarunt. Nam divinorum verborum loco, turpitudinem proferebat: pro gravibus verbis petulantiam; pro pietate impietatem; pro continentia scortationem, adulterium, masculam venerem, furtum, escam et potum vitæ hominum utilia esse docens.' E. H. iv. 22.

But, to leave the profane scurrilities of the Alexandrians, and to return to what is serious, and very serious, let us hear the judgment of Erasmus: 'Quid cogitabunt (a fide Christiana alieni) si viderint rem usque adeo difficilem esse, ut nunquam satis discussum sit quibus verbis de Christo sit loquendum? perinde quasi cum moroso quopiam agas dæmone, quem in tuam ipsius perniciem evocaris, si quid te fefellerit in verbis præscriptis, ac non potius cum clementissimo Servatore, qui a nobis præter puram simplicemque vitam nihil exigit.' Epist. 329.

For these and such remarks, Erasmus was frequently accused of Arianism by his enemies. 'Erasmus,' as Le Clerc observes, 'Arianismi ab illius ævi monachis, aliisque non melioribus, insimulatus est; quasi nimio fuisset ingenio, quam ut orthodoxus esse posset.'

'Scripture, say the Protestants, is the only rule of faith in matters pertaining to revealed religion, and they say well. There is no other Christianity than this; no other test of doctrines than this; no other centre of union than this. Whatsoever is not *clearly* delivered there, may be *true*, but cannot be *important*. HÆC MEA EST SENTENTIA, NEQVE ME EX EA VLLIVS VNQVAM AVT DOCTI AVT INDOCTI MOVEBIT ORATIO.'

If, when the quarrel between Alexander and Arius was grown to such a height as to want a remedy, the Fathers of the church had, for the sake of peace, agreed to draw up a confession of faith[p] in words of Scripture, and to establish the divinity of Christ in the expressions used by the apostles, every one might have assented to it, and the Arian party would most certainly have received it. The difference of sentiments indeed, and of interpretation, would not have ceased, but the controversy would have cooled and dwindled away, after every champion had discharged his

[p] It had been better to have dropped and dismissed the question; but perhaps this was impracticable, 'in tantis animorum incendiis.'

zeal upon paper, and had written to his heart's content. The Arian notion, that 'the Son was created in time,' and that 'there was a time when he existed not,' would probably have sunk, as not being the language of the New Testament; and the Macedonian notion, that the Holy Ghost 'was created in time,' would have sunk with the other, for the same reason; at least, these opinions would never have been obtruded upon us as articles of faith.

One remarkable difference may be observed between the creeds which were proposed upon this occasion. The Consubstantialists drew up their creed with a view to exclude and distress the Arians[q]: the Arians had no design to distress the Consubstantialists, but usually proposed creeds to which Athanasius himself might have assented; so that, if the compilers were Arians, their creeds were not Arian.

The Semiarians agreed with the Arians in rejecting the word ὁμοούσιος, but differed from them in carrying the perfections and the dignity of the Son higher than the Arians did, and in affirming that he was ὁμοιούσιος, of *like* substance, and *like* to his Father in all things.

If Christ be God the Word, who had glory with the Father before the world was, who was in the beginning, who was before all things, by whom all things were made, &c. the *coeternity* of the Λόγος with the Father appears to be a natural and unforced consequence.

The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews seems to have been of this opinion: he uses a typical argument from the cxth Psalm, and draws a parallel between Melchisedec and Christ, intending perhaps to intimate, that what Melchisedec was figuratively or typically, that Christ was really and truly. Now Melchisedec 'had neither beginning of days, nor end of life,' nothing being recorded in Sacred Writ concerning his birth or his death: consequently the Son

[q] Auctor ipsorum Eusebius Nicomediensis Epistolâ suâ prodidit dicens: 'Si verum,' inquit, 'Dei Filium et increatum dicimus, homoousion cum Patre incipimus confiteri.' Hæc cum lecta esset Epistola in Concilio Nicæno, hoc verbum in Tractatu Fidei posuerunt Patres, quod viderunt adversariis esse formidini, ut tanquam evaginato ab ipsis gladio ipsorum nefandæ caput hæreseos amputarent. Ambrosius de Fid. ad Grat. l. iii. 7.

of God hath in reality 'neither beginning of days nor end of life.'

Dr. Clarke judged it more reasonable to admit, than to reject, the eternity of the Son. 'It cannot be denied, (says this excellent writer) that the terms SON and BEGET do most properly and necessarily imply *an act of the Father's will.* For whatsoever any person is supposed to do, not by *his power and will*, but by *mere* necessity of nature, it is not indeed *He* that *does* it at all, in any true propriety of speech, but *necessity* only. Nor can it intelligibly be made out, upon what is founded the *authority* of the Father in the *mission* of the Son, if not upon the Son's thus deriving his being from the Father's incomprehensible power and will. However, since the attributes and powers of God are evidently as *eternal* as his being, and there never was any time wherein God could not *will* what he pleased, and *do* what he *willed*; and since it is just as easy to conceive God *always acting* as *always existing*, and *operating* before all ages, as easily as *decreeing* before all ages, it will not at all follow, that That which is an effect of his *will* and *power*, must *for that reason* necessarily be limited to any definite time. Wherefore not only those antient writers who were esteemed *Semiarians*, but also the learnedest of the Fathers of the *contrary* side, even they who carried up the generation of the Son the highest of all, did still nevertheless expressly assert it to be an act of the Father's *power* and *will* —

'The notion of the *eternity* of the Son is not indeed clearly revealed in Scripture; but it seems most probable that God (ὁ Παντοκράτωρ) did *always* exercise, in some manner or other, his *eternal power* and *will* —

'Almost all the old philosophers who held the *eternity* of the world, did not thereby mean that it was *self-existent*,' &c.

See Clarke's 'Second Reply to W.' Obs. vii.

Le Clerc[r], who often declared a dislike both of the Arian

[r] Le Clerc hath observed, that Christians, forsaking the notions of the Consubstantialists and of the Arians, had come by degrees to a right way of thinking concerning the *unity* of God, namely, that God is *one* in the strictest sense, of one simple, numerical, individual essence, and that the Son and the Holy Ghost are not beings, or essences,

and of the Consubstantial system, thus delivers his opinion of Clarke's 'Scripture Doctrine,' &c.

'Dr. Clarke's doctrine seems to be the same with that of the Nicene council, excepting that he uses not the word *Consubstantial.* It is not therefore to be wondered that he should have produced so many passages from the antient Fathers in favour of his hypothesis. They who pretend that the Nicene council should be the rule of our faith, ought by no means to censure Dr. Clarke, if they understand what that council meant.' Bibl. Chois. xxvi. 419.

It is affirmed by some learned writers in this controversy, that *eternal generation*, or *derivation*, implies a *manifest contradiction.* This was also the notion of Arius, who concluded, that because the Son received his existence from the Father, therefore there must have been a time when he was not. They who say so are obliged, by unavoidable consequence, to maintain this most unphilosophical assertion, That the Father and First Cause, who hath been what he is, supremely wise, good, and powerful, from all eternity, yet could not act, and exert his wisdom, goodness, and power from all eternity. But this is what they can never prove: and the contrary opinion, namely the eternal agency of the Almighty, is far more reasonable, and is attended with no other difficulties than those which equally attend a *past eternity.*

'The eternal generation of the *Word* is not found in Scripture, nor is he called the *Son* of God upon any account antecedent to the incarnation.' So says Dr. Benne and so say some other writers on both sides of the contr versy. Yet there are expressions in the New Testamen from which, I think, it may be collected that our Saviou was *Son* of God before his earthly nativity. But (howsoever that be) since there is one God and *Father* and

or substances, but *modifications, manieres d'être,* of the Divine essence or substance.

The doctrine of a *modal, nominal, ideal* Trinity terminates unavoidably in the doctrine of *one* Divine *Person* variously manifesting himself. Whether Le Clerc saw and admitted this consequence, I cannot say. He seems to have fluctuated on this matter. See his Life of Eusebius.

First Cause of all, the difference between *Son* of God and *Word* of God is to us nominal and imperceptible, and both certainly imply a *derivation.*

St. John says that all things were made by the *Word*; St. Paul says that God made all things by his *Son*; whence it appears that the *Word*, and the *Son*, are one and the same person, receiving his existence from one and the same Father.

One of the texts on which the antients founded the generation of the *Son* before his incarnation, is in Psalm cx. 3. according to the LXX. 'Before the morning star I begat thee:' a text which certainly is full to the purpose, if we admit this antient translation of it to be right, and our present Hebrew text to want emendation.

To settle the controversial bounds between the Arians, the Semiarians, and the Athanasians or Consubstantialists of those days, and to determine how far they agreed, and how far they differed, and how far they were or were not consistent with themselves, is, if not an impossibility, yet certainly a very difficult task. They were not to be blamed for their inquiries about this subject; their disputes with Jews and Pagans must have unavoidably led them into it: but they should not have reviled and persecuted one another, or required an assent, under pain of excommunication, banishment, infamy, and beggary, to expressions not used by Sacred Writers. Is this the reverence and respect which ought to be paid to the Holy Scriptures?

Our Saviour is represented as submitting to sufferings and to death for our sakes, and then exalted by his Father to the highest glory and dominion; and because, in a submission to transient sufferings so amply rewarded, there might seem to be no great example of compassion and condescension, and of that 'love which passeth knowledge,' therefore the writers of the New Testament have given us some account of his antecedent condition, and inform us that he who was *rich* became *poor* for our sakes, and quitted a state of splendor and happiness, and *humbled* and *emptied himself*, ἐκένωσε καὶ ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτὸν, when he became man. This leads us directly to inquire into the dignity of his nature, concerning which, after all our inqui-

ries, we can know no more than the Holy Scriptures have told us; and from those passages it seems (to me at least) to be a fair inference, that 'the Son possessed, from all eternity, all that the infinite love and infinite power and infinite wisdom of the Father could communicate.'

But here it will be asked perhaps, What was the doctrine of the Nicene Fathers, and what did they mean by *Consubstantiality?*

It is impossible to answer this question without using logical and metaphysical terms.

By the word ὁμοούσιος, they meant, not *of the same* numerical *or* individual *substance*, but *of the same* generical *substance* or *subsistence*[s]. As, amongst men, a son is ὁμοούσιος with his father, that is, *of the same human nature*; so, in their opinion[t], the Son of God is ὁμοούσιος with the Father, that is, *of the same divine nature.*

By this word, therefore, they intended to express *the same kind of nature*, and so far a *natural equality.*

But, according to them, this *natural equality* excluded not a *relative inequality*; a *majority* and *minority*, founded upon the everlasting difference between *giving* and *receiving*, *causing* and being *caused.*

They had no notion of distinguishing between *person* and *being*, between *an intelligent agent*, and *an intelligent active substance*, *subsistence*, or *entity.*

When they said that the Father was *God*, they meant that he was God *of himself*, *originally*, and *underived*; Θεὸς ἀγέννητος, and ὁ Θεός.

When they said that the Son was *God*, they meant

[s] That ὁμοούσιος means 'of one substance in kind,' hath been showed by Petavius, Curcellæus, Cudworth, Le Clerc, Clarke, &c. and to prove it would be 'actum agere.'

[t] Ὁμοούσιος τῷ Πατρὶ κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, καὶ ὁμοούσιος ἡμῖν κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα· 'of one substance with the Father, as to his divinity, and of one substance with us, as to his humanity.' Concil. Chalcedonense. So say the writers of the fifth century, who were called orthodox: but they who speak thus must have understood by ὁμοούσιος, 'of one substance in kind,' if we suppose them to have had any ideas affixed to their words, and to have been consistent with themselves; which is more indeed than I would affirm.

that he was God by *generation* or *derivation*; Θεὸς γενητός.

The *Unity* of God they maintained, and they defended it, first, by considering the Father as the First Cause, the only Underived and Self-existing; secondly, by supposing an intimate, inseparable, and incomprehensible union, connection, indwelling, and co-existence, by which the Father was in the Son, and the Son in the Father; and thirdly, by saying that in the Father and the Son there was an unity of will, design, and consent, and one divine power and dominion, originally in the Father, and derivatively in the Son.

Such seems to have been their system; and my design is barely to represent it, and to do it justice.

In process of time Christians went into a notion that the Son was ταυτοούσιος and μονοούσιος, 'of the same *individual* substance with the Father, and with the Holy Spirit;' and they seem to have done this with a view to secure the doctrine of the *unity*.

The school-men took up the subject, and treated it in their way, which they called *explaining*, and which men of sense call *impenetrable jargon*.

Of all the modern writers upon this controversy, they who have undertaken to prove the doctrine of the Trinity by *Cabbalism*, have *talked* in the most singular manner; though, I doubt not, with very honest and upright intentions.

A notable specimen of this way of *talking* is produced in 'Clarke's Letter to Wells.' The author, whosoever he was, informs us, that Job xii. 12. 'with the antient is wisdom,' means 'With the Father and the Son is the Holy Spirit;' that the 'maid' in Job xxxi. 1, 2. is the 'Virgin Mary;' that Christ 'sent himself,' and consequently 'prayed and returned thanks to himself, interceded with himself,' &c. that 'whilst he was upon earth the kingdom of heaven was held in commission, and managed by the angels,' &c. &c. He should have added to all his proofs the *spurious* text in 1 John v. 7. 'There are three that bear record,' &c. I call it spurious, since so much may be urged against it, and so little for it.

One Meyer wrote a book, 'De Mysterio S. S. Trinitatis ex solius Veteris Testamenti Libris demonstrato.' The text which he urges as the most clear and conclusive of all, is Deut. vi. 4. 'Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord:' in which he is not at all singular, many of his Cabbalistic brethren having made the same remark on the same text.

Rabbi Judah hath preserved a tradition, that the antient Jews, in their liturgy, used this form of prayer; 'I and HE, save, I pray:' and this *Galimatias* is a mystical representation of the Trinity, according to some persons who were learned men, but too much addicted to Rabbinism. See Jac. Alting Gram. Heb. exerc. iii. and Vitringa in Jesai. xliii. p. 469.

The famous Postellus observed that there were *eleven thousand* proofs of the Trinity in the Old Testament, interpreted rightly, that is, ἐτυμολογικομυστικοκαββαλιστικῶς.

'Your friend (says Clarke to Nelson) being a sincere and sober-minded man, has entered only a little way into these traditionary explications of Scripture; but those who have gone far into them have given such visionary and Cabbalistical interpretations, especially of the Old Testament, as give too sad occasion for infidels to look upon all religion as enthusiasm, and particularly have caused the study of the Hebrew language, which of itself is a plain, easy, inartificial language, to be brought, by men of weak judgment abusing it, into the utmost contempt.'

Abbadie, a man of vivacity and of a warm imagination, wrote two Treatises: in the one he proved with much spirit and elegance the truth of natural and revealed religion, in the other he defended the divinity of Christ; but how? By laying down his own notion of it, and then arguing that if it was not true, our Saviour was what is too shocking to be named or thought of, and what no Mahometan would call him[v].

Few controversies have been carried on with less temper and with less prudence than this.

Before the fourth century was ended, the Consubstan-

[v] This odious indiscretion hath been frequent amongst disputers of more zeal than judgment.

tialists differed and disputed amongst themselves, whether in the Trinity there were three *hypostases*, or one *hypostasis*: part of them held the first, and part the second opinion; and it hath been supposed by some, that they had notions directly contrary to each other: but the truth is, that they only misunderstood one another, and were in reality of the same mind.

For the word ὑπόστασις was ambiguous, and had two senses. In the first sense, *hypostasis* is 'the existence of a thing,' or 'the manner in which it exists;' in the second sense it is 'the existing thing,' or 'the substance itself.'

Three human souls have only one *hypostasis*, in the first sense, that is, one and the same kind of nature, consisting of intelligence, activity, &c. but in the second sense, they are three *hypostases*, that is, three intelligent active beings.

The Consubstantialists, who said that in the Trinity there was one *hypostasis*, took the word in the first sense; and their brethren, who said there were three *hypostases*, took the word in the second sense; and thus the dispute was verbal, and as soon as they came to understand one another they were reconciled.

In the fourth century, the Consubstantialists began the persecution, by excommunicating and banishing their adversaries.

After the death of Constantine, Constantius persecuted the Consubstantialists; and the Arians under his protection (as afterwards under Valens) were guilty of many horrible outrages and cruelties, which must have hurt their cause greatly, and have made honest men hold them in abomination.

Julian gave liberty to all the contenders to fight it out in disputation, and recalled those whom Constantius had banished.

Jovian favoured the Consubstantialists during his short reign.

Valentinian, like a wise prince, kept an even hand between both parties, and would not be the tool of either.

Valens at the same time persecuted the Consubstantialists in his dominions.

Gratian and Theodosius oppressed the Arians.

The Arians were also divided into sects which anathematized and plagued each other. But Arianism subsisted, and made a considerable figure for above three hundred years, and was at last destroyed by violence and persecution. See Bayle's Dict. *Arius*.

In the fourth century were held thirteen councils against Arius, fifteen for him, and seventeen for the Semiarians; in all forty-five.

How could the Arians, in the time of Constantius and Valens, bring themselves to such an unchristian persecuting temper? how could they oppress their fellow Christians, the Consubstantialists, who, supposing them to have been in an error, fell into it through a religious fear of ascribing too little to their Redeemer, and of not paying him sufficient honour? Can a man love his Saviour, and hate his brother for a mistake of this kind?

And how could the Consubstantialists persuade themselves that an Arian, who perhaps had suffered for professing Christianity in times of distress, who believed Christ to be his Maker, his Saviour, his King, and his Judge, would *choose* to detract from his dignity, and to offend him in whom he placed all his hopes of salvation? Human nature is not capable of this folly; and if the man were in an error, yet in such a person the error must have been involuntary, a mere defect of the understanding, and not a fault of the will.

A Christian, and a lover of peace, who lived in obscurity, and whose name I cannot tell, stood up, and said:

'My brethren, The things to be believed are few, the things to be done are many; but you behave yourselves as if the reverse of this were true. St. Paul tells you, "The Grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men; teaching us, that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world, looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearance of the great God, and (of) our Saviour Jesus Christ." Concerning the nature of *Jesus* you can dispute incessantly, and concerning the word *Grace* you will probably dispute no less; but the rest of the sen-

tence you disregard as of small consequence or importance. What, I beseech you, must the Jews and the Pagans conceive of you and of your religion? And what do the holy angels think, who look down upon your contentions? Those blessed and compassionate spirits pity you, and think you mere children: But when from contending you proceed to beating your fellow-servants, to persecuting and destroying, they consider you as most malicious and wicked children; their pity is changed into indignation, and they would strike you dead, if the Supreme Governor did not stay their hand, and remind them that such disorders must needs arise, and shall one day be rectified.'

So said this *Unknown*; but behold the consequence! The Consubstantialists called him an Arian, and the Arians called him a Consubstantialist.

The Nicene Fathers having anathematized the Arians, the emperor seconded them, and banished Arius and the bishops who sided with him, and ordered the books of Arius to be burnt; and added,—'If any man be found to have concealed a copy of those books, and not to have instantly produced it and thrown it into the fire, he shall be put to death. The Lord be with you all!' Socrat. i. p. 32.

Constantine's conduct was variable afterwards; for he certainly understood not this perplexed and obscure controversy, and he acted as he was influenced at different times by the ecclesiastics of each party, who accused one another not only of heterodoxy, but of being enemies to the emperor, and of other faults and misdemeanours.

The creed of Arius, which he delivered to Constantine, and upon which the emperor ordered him to be recalled and restored, is thus:

'We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, and in our Lord Jesus Christ his Son, begotten of him before all ages, God the Word, by whom all things were made in heaven and in earth, who descended and was incarnate, suffered, arose, and ascended into heaven, and will come again to judge the living and the dead. We believe in the Holy Ghost, the resurrection of the flesh, the life to come,

and the kingdom of heaven, and in one catholic Church of God dispersed over all the earth.

'This faith we have received from the holy Gospels, in which the Lord says to his disciples, Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. If we do not believe these things, and truly acknowledge the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, as the whole Catholic Church and the Scriptures teach, to which we yield an assent in all things, God is our judge both now and at the day of judgment,' &c. Socr. i. 26. Soz. ii. 27.

Arius died suddenly, A. D. 336.; upon which the opinions were various.

Some ascribed it to a violent distemper.

Others to his excess of joy, at finding his affairs in a good situation.

Others called it a judgment.

Lastly, the Arians said that his adversaries had killed him by some wicked arts, γοητείαις; and surely it is not impossible that amongst his numerous enemies there might be one who would not scruple to give him a dose, and to send him out of the way.

Athanasius, as we may suppose, accounted it an unquestionable miracle, and a divine judgment upon him for perjury; and uses the same words in which the Scriptures describe the death of Judas. Ἀλλ' εὐθυς ἐξελθὼν, ὥσπερ δίκην δὺς, κατέπεσε· καὶ πρηνὴς γενόμενος, ἐλάκησε μέσος. 'Verum illico egressus, tanquam pœnas luens, corruit; et pronus jacens crepuit medius.' Apud Sozom. ii. 30.

George Valla, a professor of humanity, died in the same manner as was reported of Arius: 'Dum corpori vacaturus excrementa cibi dejecit, animam etiam morte subitaria exhalavit.' Such accidents befall one as well as another. See Bayle's Reflections upon it, Dict. *Valla*.

It is thought by Valesius, that the Arius who was reconciled to the church at the council of Jerusalem in 335, was not the more celebrated Arius, but another ecclesiastic of the same name, and of the same party; but this opinion is pretty generally rejected. See the notes on Socr. i. 33. and Soz. ii. 30. and Bayle's Dict. *Arius*. E.

'Alexander, bishop of Constantinople, refused to receive Arius to communion, though the emperor had ordered him to do it, and though the Arian bishops were determined to conduct Arius to church in spite of Alexander. In this extremity, not knowing how to act a consistent part, and to proceed as he had begun, he shut himself up, as history says, in the church, and there prayed most devoutly to God, not that he himself might be instructed what he should think of these things, and how he should act, or that Arius might be converted from his errors; but his prayer was, *that if the opinions of Arius were true, he himself might not live to see the day when they were to be discussed*; *and that if he himself was orthodox, Arius, who had been the cause of so many evils, might be punished for his impiety.* A prayer which had so little charity in it, and by which it appeared that the prelate was more solicitous for his own honour than for the truth, was however successful, and Arius died, either on that day, or on the day following.' Le Clerc, Bibl. Univ. x. 474.

But perhaps the story was made by the Athanasians after the event, and the bishop did not pray in this strange manner.

Nothing had been decreed by the Nicene council concerning the nature of the Holy Ghost, and no controversy was raised on that subject, till Macedonius, bishop of Constantinople, taught that the Holy Ghost was *a creature.* They who afterwards held that notion were called Macedonians, or Marathonians, from one Marathonius, bishop of Nicomedia. The Arians were probably of the same opinion.

The Semiarians assembled a council at Seleucia, and drew up a creed, in these words:

'We acknowledge and believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, of things visible and invisible: We believe also in our Lord Jesus Christ, his Son, begotten of him *without passion*[x] before all ages, God the Word, the only begotten of God, (who is) Light, Life, Truth, and Wisdom, by whom all things

[x] ἀπαθῶς.

were made, in heaven and upon earth, visible and invisible. We believe that in the end of ages, to abolish sin, he assumed flesh of the holy Virgin Mary, and became man, and suffered for our offences, and rose again, and was taken up into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of the Father, and shall come again with glory to judge the living and the dead. We believe also in the Holy Ghost, which our Lord and Saviour called a *Paraclete*[y], and promised to send, and did send to his disciples after his departure, by which also he sanctifies all those in the church who believe, and are baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' Socr. ii. 40.

Socrates, who was a candid man, seems to approve of this creed, and says; 'Ego vero affirmo, si ab initio de Nicæna fide ita sensissent tum ii qui ante istos vixerant, tum qui illos subsecuti sunt, cessaturam fuisse quæstionem omnem et contentionem, nec violentum et rationis expertem tumultum in ecclesia fuisse valiturum. Sed quemadmodum ista se habeant, prudentioribus judicandum relinquo.'

The Nicene creed:

'We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of all things visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten *and* only-begotten of the Father; that is, of the substance of the Father[z], God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, consubstantial with the Father, by whom all things were made both in heaven and in earth: who for us men, and for our salvation, descended and was incarnate, and was made man, suffered, and rose again the third day, ascended into the heavens, and will come to judge the living and the dead. (*We believe*) also in the Holy Ghost.

'The holy Catholic and Apostolic Church anathematizes those who say that there was a time when the Son of God was not, and that before he was begotten he was not,

[y] 'Comforter,' or, 'Advocate.'

[z] *of*, or *from*, or *out of*, the substance of the Father: ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρός.

and that he was made out of nothing, or out of another substance or essence, and is created, or changeable, or alterable.' Apud Socr. i. 8.

Such was the Nicene creed, as it stood originally, and before it was interpolated by subsequent councils. Our church hath dropped the anathematizing clauses at the end, and one cannot help wishing that the Nicene Fathers had done the same. The Christians in times following were perpetually making anathematisms, even upon the slightest and poorest occasions; and it is really a wonder that they did not at last insert in their Litanies, 'We beseech thee to curse and confound the Pelagians, Semipelagians, Nestorians, Eutychians, Monothelites, Jacobites, Iconoclasts, and all heretics and schismatics.'

About the time of Constantine, Christian festivals and holy-days began to take place of Pagan solemnities.

The Council of Arles was held A. D. 314. on account of the Donatists. The tenth canon of this council exhorts men, whose wives had been convicted of adultery, not to marry again till the adultress were dead. An unreasonable request.

When Constantine was about to make war with Licinius, there was a wonderful apparition, says Eusebius; several regiments of Constantine's soldiers were seen at noon day marching, as victorious, through the cities belonging to Licinius. Eusebius however had the discretion to introduce the story with a φασι, 'they say,' and took care, by so doing, to affirm nothing that was not true; for without question there were people enough who said so. Vit. Const. ii. 6. But in his Life of Constantine he is to be considered as an orator and a panegyrist, rather than as an historian.

Nazarius, who was a Pagan, in his Panegyric of Constantine, mentions such a miracle of an army descending from heaven to assist that prince against Maxentius. 'In ore denique est omnium Galliarum, exercitus visos, qui se divinitus missos præ se ferebant—Illi cælo lapsi, illi divinitus missi gloriabantur quod tibi militabant.

'In ore est omnium Galliarum,' quoth he. These Gauls were what the French call 'des temoins Normans,'—Norman witnesses.

It is strange, says Le Clerc, that no Christian author hath mentioned these angels whom God sent to assist Constantine, and that Nazarius, who speaks of this miracle, says nothing of that of the cross. Bibl. Chois. iii. 352.

Constantine transferred the seat of empire to Byzantium, which he embellished, enlarged, and made equal to antient Rome, and to which he gave his own name; by which he certainly disobliged the Roman senate and people. This change contributed to weaken the western part of the empire, and to bring on its dissolution. But whether it were prudent or no, politically considered, it seems to have been of no moral import; virtue and religion and liberty neither gained nor lost by it; nor, in all probability, could the Roman empire have continued entire upon the foot that it was in the time of Constantine, though Rome had remained the unrivalled city, and the usual place of the emperor's residence.

Constantine had a divine revelation to build Constantinople, says Sozomen, and the emperor himself affirmed the same[z] in one of his laws; and according to Philostorgius, he declared that he was guided by a heavenly vision in tracing the extent of the new city. In this city no Pagan temples, rites, and ceremonies were permitted, say Eusebius, Sozomen, and Orosius: Zosimus says the contrary. Thus much is certain, that Christianity prevailed far more there than at Rome. Soz. ii. 3.

When Constantine went to war, he carried with him a tent, in form of a chapel, where he prayed to God, and had presbyters and deacons to perform divine service; and thence began the custom in the Roman army for each legion to have a chaplain. Sozom. i. 8.

As he was on many occasions generous and liberal,

[z] Or seemed to affirm it. 'Pro commoditate Urbis quam æterno nomine, *jubente Deo*, donavimus, hæc vobis privilegia credidimus deferenda,' &c. Cod. Th. l. xiii. tit. v. p. 63. where see Cothofred.

and did so much for the church, and gave so much to ecclesiastics, Soz. i. 8. he might have extended his favours also to men of letters; but it appears not that he signalized himself that way. In his reign, and in the fourth century, as religious and metaphysical quarrels ran high, and monkery grew and prospered, and miracles abounded, so liberal arts and sciences, and polite literature, fell into a declining condition.

He seems to have been possessed with the *building spirit*, and spent immense sums upon houses, palaces, and churches[a]; and particularly upon Constantinople. This, and his profuse gifts to some who deserved them, and to others who deserved them not, obliged him to burden his people with taxes.

He built a church, and dedicated it to the twelve apostles, and intended to be buried there for the benefit of his soul. ὡς ἂν καὶ μετὰ τελευτὴν ἀξιῶτο τῶν ἐνταυθοῖ μελλουσῶν ἐπὶ τιμῇ τῶν ἀποστόλων συντελεῖσθαι εὐχῶν—ὠφέλειαν ψυχῆς ὀνησιφόρον τὴν τῶνδε μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι αὐτῷ πιστεύων· 'quo scilicet precationum quæ in honorem apostolorum ibi celebrandæ erant, etiam mortuus particeps fieret.—pro certo sibi persuadens, horum memoriam non parum utilitatis animæ suæ esse allaturam.' Eusebius Vit. Const. iv. 60.

These things Eusebius mentions with approbation, and they show how even such men as he were not free from superstition.

Constantine was perhaps the first Christian who was buried in a church; which afterwards became a common practice.

There is a story about him in Chrysostom, t. i. orat. 20. related by Flavian, which is much to his credit; that some rioters having done outrage to one of his statues, and they who excited him to revenge and severity having told him, amongst other things, that his face had been pelted with stones, and all over bruised and battered, he put his hand to his face, and said that he did not feel it.

He was neither so good as Christian writers describe

[a] Joannes Ciampini gives an account of them in a Treatise, 'De Sacris Ædificiis a Constantino Magno constructis.'

him, nor so bad as some Pagans represent him. He must have greatly offended the latter, since he not only established Christianity, but began the destruction of Paganism by various discouragements; by shutting up some temples, pulling down some, and stripping others of their gods and ornaments. He was indeed guilty of several faults, but upon the whole, his good qualities may perhaps outweigh the bad. Fleury observes very prettily, 'On ne se trompera point sur Constantin, en croyant le mal qu'en dit Eusebe, et le bien qu'en dit Zosime.'

Eutropius hath judged freely of him, and not amiss. 'Insolentia rerum secundarum aliquantum Constantinum ex illa favorabili animi docilitate mutavit. Primum necessitudines persecutus, egregium virum et sororis filium, omnimodæ indolis juvenem interfecit; mox uxorem, post numerosos amicos. Vir primo imperii tempore optimis principibus, ultimo mediis comparandus.' l. x.

Excessive honours, and little short of divine, were paid by the Christians to his name, to his tomb, and to his statue, after his death. He was called a saint, and a saint equal to the apostles; and as Proculus forsware himself to make Romulus a God, so Nicephorus had the effrontery to declare that God had endued the urn and the statue of Constantine with miraculous powers, and that whosoever touched them was healed of all diseases and infirmities. The Pagans, who scorned to be less complaisant than the Christians, made him a God. Philostorg. ii. 17. Theodoret i. 34. Nicephorus viii. 55. Eutropius.

EUSTATHIUS bishop of Antioch, a great friend of Athanasius, was deposed by the synod of Antioch, for Sabellianism, A. D. 327. 'Some relate,' says Socrates, 'that it was for other faults, which yet they have not mentioned: and indeed it is a custom with our spiritual rulers, when they depose a man, to load him with general accusations, and to call him irreligious and impious, but never to specify and declare particularly of what impiety he is guilty. Ὡς μὲν οὖν τινες φασὶν, δι' ἄλλας οὐκ ἀγαθὰς αἰτίας· φανερῶς γὰρ οὐκ εἰρήκασι. τοῦτο δὲ ἐπὶ πάντων εἰώθασι τῶν καθαιρουμένων ποιεῖν οἱ ἐπίσκοποι, κατηγοροῦντες μὲν καὶ

ἀσεβεῖν λέγοντες, τὰς δὲ αἰτίας τῆς ἀσεβείας οὐ προστιθέντες, i. 24.

Whsooever sits down to examine the state of the Christian world, civil and religious, in the fourth and fifth centuries, if he be not strangely prejudiced, will find his veneration for those days to wear off apace, and, if he lives in a Protestant country, will learn perhaps to be contented with his own times, which, such as they are, deserve the preference.

RUFINUS, and from him Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret, give us an account of the conversion of some Indian nations [b] in the time of Constantine, of which the substance is as follows:

These Indians, being at variance with the Romans, slew all the passengers in a ship which put into one of their harbours, except two boys, Frumentius and Ædesius, whom Meropius, a Christian and a philosopher, of Tyre, and a relation of theirs, had taken along with him. These boys were presented to the king of the country, who made Frumentius his secretary, and Ædesius his cup-bearer. The king died, leaving a wife and a young child, and Frumentius administered the affairs of the kingdom, together with Ædesius, during the minority of the young king. Frumentius, inquiring amongst the Roman merchants who traded there, found some Christians, who under his protection assembled together, and built a church, and catechized some of the Indians. Frumentius, resigning his office, which he had filled with credit and integrity, got leave to return home with Ædesius, and, coming to Alexandria, exhorted Athanasius to send over some ecclesiastics to that country. He was prevailed upon to go back himself, as the most proper person; and being made a bishop, he preached the gospel there with great suc-

[b] Or of a people of Æthiopia, whose capital was Auxumis. Tillemont hath collected many things concerning Frumentius, H. E. vii. 284. Ludolphus in his 'Historia Æthiopica' says, that, according to the Greek, Latin, and Æthiopic writers, the Abyssines were converted by Frumentius, and that Cedrenus and Nicephorus were mistaken in placing the conversion of this people so low as the reign of Justinian.

cess, *healing the sick, and working many miracles.* This account Rufinus received from Ædesius, who was returned home to Tyre, and was there a presbyter of the church. Socrates i. 19. Sozomen ii. 24. Theodoret i. 29. Rufinus.

About the same time the Iberi received Christianity, as we learn from Rufinus, and after him from Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret. The Iberi inhabited a country between the Euxine sea and the Caspian, which is now called Georgia. A Christian woman, who was a captive, had gained the esteem and respect of the people by her good behaviour. It was a custom there to carry sick children from house to house, to ask advice of the neighbourhood. A child being brought to her, she put him upon her bed, and prayed for him, and restored him to health. The queen of the country, being very ill, and hearing of this, came to her, and was healed in like manner. The king and the queen offered her great rewards, which she would not accept, but exhorted them to embrace her religion. Thus far the story has a good face; but

'Desinit in piscem mulier formosa superne.'

For the present the exhortations of the female captive had no effect upon the king. Afterwards, as he was hunting in a forest, it grew quite dark on a sudden, and he knew not which way to go, and was in great distress: he called upon Jesus Christ, and the day-light instantly returned. Upon this he sent for the woman, was instructed by her in Christianity, recommended it to his subjects, and sent for proper teachers to Constantine [c], who received his messengers with great kindness, and appointed a bishop to go with them. In the mean time the king erected a church, at the building of which a very improbable miracle is related to have been wrought; a pillar was moved, and raised up, and suspended in the air, by the prayers of the woman. Rufinus says that he had this account from Ba-

[c] To this Constantine seems to allude in his Epistle to the Council of Tyre. 'Mea certe opera divino Numini inserviente, ubique terrarum pax viget; ipsis etiam barbaris Dei nomen sincere venerantibus, qui ad hoc usque tempus veritatem ignoraverant——' Socr. i. 34. Soz. ii. 28.

curius. Bacurius was prince of the Iberi, and a general in the Roman service, under Valens and Theodosius, about forty years after the conversion of that people. Zosimus, who was a zealous Pagan, commends him as a very brave and very honest man. Ἕλκων μὲν ἐξ Ἀρμενίας τὸ γένος, ἔξω δὲ πάσης κακοηθείας ἀνὴρ, μετὰ τοῦ τὰ πολεμικὰ πεπαιδεῦσθαι. l. iv. See Rufinus x. 10. Socrates i. 20. Sozomen ii. 7. Theodoret i. 24.

As to the facts in these two relations, which are not miraculous, there is no sufficient reason to deny them; but the preternatural part, particularly in the story of the Iberi [d], calls loudly for abatements: however, the occasion, the converting of two nations to Christianity, might be worthy of miracles, such as healing the diseased, and we should rather expect to find them here than in the dens of monks, or at the graves of the martyrs. Eusebius says nothing at all of these transactions.

The miracle of the *pillar* was perhaps borrowed from Pliny; that of the *darkness* from Ovid.

'Summa miracula, epistylia tantæ molis attolli potuisse. —Difficillime hoc contigit in limine ipso quod foribus imponebat. Etenim ea maxima moles fuit: nec sedit in cubili, anxio artifice, mortis destinatione suprema. Traduntque in ea cogitatione fessum nocturno tempore in quiete vidisse præsentem Deam, cui templum fiebat, hortantem ut viveret: se composuisse lapidem: atque ita postero die apparuit, et pondere ipso correctus videbatur.' He speaks of the temple of the Ephesian Diana, xxxvi. 21.

'Exierat tecto Laurentes Picus in agros,
Indigenas fixurus apros—
Tum quoque cantato densetur carmine cœlum,
Et nebulas exhalat humus, cæcisque vagantur
Limitibus comites, et abest custodia regi,'

Met. xiv. 342.

[d] Miracles are now ceased amongst this people, by their own acknowledgment. When the Popish missionaries tell the Georgians what miracles are still wrought in the church of Rome, the Georgians answer, That is a lie, for we have none now wrought amongst us. Galani Historia Armena.

To these missionaries we may add an Arian missionary, who flourished about the same time, and whose history is thus delivered by Philostorgius.

Constantius, like his father Constantine, was very desirous to spread the gospel in foreign parts. He sent an embassy to a people called *Homeritæ* [c], supposed to have been the antient Sabæans, and the posterity of Abraham by Keturah, dwelling in Arabia Felix. They circumcised their children on the eighth day, and sacrificed to the sun, moon, and dæmons of the country, and many Jews dwelt amongst them. The emperor sent magnificent presents to their prince, and desired he would permit churches to be built in his dominions for the Roman merchants who resorted thither, and for those natives who should embrace Christianity.

One of the principal ambassadors was Theophilus, an Indian, who in his youth had been sent an hostage to Constantine, from the inhabitants of the island Diu, and, settling at Rome, led a monastic life, and had a great reputation for sanctity. Eusebius of Nicomedia had ordained him deacon, and upon this occasion the Arians made him a bishop. Perhaps, says Valesius, they did this through emulation, and to equal one of their own sect to Frumentius, who had been consecrated and sent to Æthiopia in like manner by Athanasius.

Theophilus preached the gospel to the Homeritæ, was opposed violently by the Jews, whom he put to silence *by working miracles*, converted the king and many of the people, and established Christianity in those parts.

After this he went to Diu, to visit his own country, and passed through many regions of India where the gospel was already received, and where he rectified some irregularities in practice; for as to matters of faith there was nothing amiss, says Philostorgius, and they were all of the Arian persuasion.

Thence he went to the Æthiopians called *Auxumitæ*, and settled things pertaining to religion.

Then he returned to Rome, was highly honoured by the emperor, remained with the title of bishop, but without any

[c] See Gothofred on the Cod. Th. l. xii. tit. xii. p. 582.

particular church or diocese, and was esteemed and beloved by all those of his own sect, as a most excellent and pious man.

'Tradit Philostorgius Auxumitas a Theophilo Ariano conversos tempore Constantii; cum populi istius conversio revera tribuenda sit Frumentio orthodoxo, ordinato ab Athanasio.' Lowth. To contradict Philostorgius, he makes him affirm more than his words imply. Τοῖς Αὐξουμίταις δὲ παραγεγονὼς, καὶ τὰ ἐκεῖσε καταστησάμενος, τῆς ἐπὶ Ῥωμαίους ἀνακομιδῆς εἴχετο. 'Sed cum ad Auxumitas venisset, et cuncta illic negotia probe ordinasset, inde ad Romanorum ditionem redire cœpit.' iii. p. 489.

Constantius, and Gallus his nephew, had sworn friendship and fidelity to each other in the presence of this Theophilus: therefore, when Constantius was resolved to destroy Gallus, Theophilus interposed, and exclaimed against it; upon which Constantius banished him. But afterwards, the emperor's beloved wife being very ill, he had recourse to Theophilus, who was reported to work miracles and to heal the sick; he therefore recalled him, owned his fault, begged pardon, and entreated him earnestly to cure his wife. Theophilus laid his hands upon her, and she recovered. Yet, after this, he banished Theophilus a second time, suspecting him to have been a favourer of Gallus.

Theophilus is said to have raised a woman from the dead. 'Aiunt etiam eum aliquando Antiochiæ Judæam quandam ex mortuis suscitasse. Id autem affirmat Thalassius, qui cum illo diutissime versatus est, et in hujusmodi rebus extra suspicionem est mendacii: et qui alioqui haud paucos habet hujus rei testes qui eodem tempore vixerunt.' So Suidas, who is supposed to have taken it from Philostorgius.

'Philostorgius says that Theophilus the Indian, his pretended apostle of Arianism, having been banished, was recalled by Constantius to heal his wife, and that he did heal her miraculously. Photius seems to deride this miracle by his manner of relating it, and we know how little credit Philostorgius deserves, especially in the miracles which he ascribes to those of his own sect. But moreover we are

assured that the distemper of which he says that the empress was cured by Theophilus, and which he calls μητρομανίαν, was the very distemper of which she died, according to Zonaras. For though Theophilus (he should have said, Philostorgius) names not the empress, there is no question but that he means Eusebia.' Tillemont Hist. des Emp. iv. 677.

That Photius speaks contemptuously of the cure, is more than I can discern. See Philostorg. p. 504. I blame not Tillemont for rejecting all these miracles, which seem to have been rumours raised and spread to serve a party; but the true reason of his disbelief is, that they were Arian miracles; and if they had been reported concerning Athanasius, all difficulties would have been smoothed over, and accounted of small moment.

UNDER Constantine lived Spyridon, bishop of a city in Cyprus. Socrates i. 12. and Sozomen i. 11. have recorded some incredible miracles wrought by him, and also his preferring works of charity to the observation of a fast, his giving meat to a weary traveller on a day in Lent, and eating along with him to encourage him.

AGAPETUS, an Arian, was at first a soldier, then a presbyter, and then bishop of Synnada. He raised the dead, and healed the sick, and wrought various miracles, and converted a great number of Pagans, if we may believe Philostorgius, p. 481. Eusebius hath made no mention of this saint.

THE GREATEST of all wonders, which is said to have happened in the days of Constantine, was the discovery of the *true cross*, which immediately produced the superstitious veneration of it, and ended in the grossest idolatry, in worshipping the very wood. Nothing, says Tillemont, is more certain; for it is attested by Rufinus, Sulpitius Severus, Theodoret, Socrates, Sozomen, Ambrose, Paulinus, and Chrysostom.

'Historia hæc de inventione sanctæ crucis non occurrit apud Eusebium. Verum Cyrillus episcopus Hierosolymitanus, qui eodem seculo vixit, aperte testatur lignum sanc-

tæ crucis, imperatori Constantino divinitus ostensum.—item in catechesi de ejus inventione loquitur, ut de re omnibus nota. Quocirca de historiæ hujus fide dubitari non potest.' Lowth ad Socrat. i. 17. What did this protestant divine of ours mean? Could he believe that the true cross was found? or would he only say that a pretended one was discovered?

I cannot give a better account of this affair, as it stands in Rufinus, &c. than in the words of Tillemont, which are extremely well adapted to the story, and full of what the French call *unction*, and the English, *canting*. But first we will transcribe a few lines from another author.

'It is said that Constantine found the cross of Jesus Christ, and that many miracles were wrought by it. And yet it is surprising enough, that Eusebius, eye-witness of these transactions, who exactly describes all the circumstances in the discovery of the sepulchre of Christ, and who forgets nothing that could turn to the advantage of religion, says not a single word either of the cross, or of the miracles which are pretended to have been performed by it.' Thus Du Pin[f], fairly and honestly, Bibl. ii. 15. Now for Tillemont;

[f] This worthy man suffered (as such men commonly do) for his frankness and candour. 'The archbishop of Paris published an Ordinance against his 'Bibliotheque,' and condemned it, as containing "several propositions false, rash, scandalous, capable of offending pious ears; tending to weaken the proofs of tradition for the authority of Canonical Books, and for many other articles of faith; *injurious to General Councils*; to the Holy Apostolic See, and to the Fathers of the Church; erroneous, and leading to heresy, *respectivè*."

'The archbishop would rather have had this book purged and corrected; but "the evil," as he said, "being spread quite through the work," he judged it more convenient to condemn and suppress it, and forbid the reading of it. The parliament also suppressed it. But the person of the author was spared, because of his absolute submission to the Ordinance of the prelate, to whom he presented a declaration upon twelve heads, signed with his own hand, in which he acknowledges that in some points he was mistaken; he explains himself upon the rest, and confesses that he had not well expressed his sentiments, nor sufficiently weighed the terms which he had used.—This declaration of Du Pin was printed, together with the decrees of the archbishop and of the parliament.

'I mention not this to hurt the character of his book. On the contrary, I am persuaded that all men of sense, especially amongst the

'When Saint Helena, the mother of Constantine, was arrived at Jerusalem, and had begun to visit the sacred places, the Holy Ghost inflamed her with a desire to find the wood of the cross. But there was no person who had ever seen it, or could tell where it had been hid. She then inquired for the place where Christ was crucified, and found it out by the help of the Jews and Christians; or, as Rufinus says, by some revelation: and being moved by the Holy Spirit, she ordered the buildings to be pulled down, and the rubbish to be removed. The faith of this female saint was recompensed beyond expectation; and upon digging very deep, they found the holy sepulchre, and near it three crosses, with the title which had been affixed to the cross of Christ, and the nails which had pierced his sacred body. But still a difficulty remained, to distinguish which was the cross of Christ. Saint Macarius, who was bishop of Jerusalem, proposed the method. He was a prelate illustrious for his wisdom, and truly worthy of God, and he had just then overthrown the heresy of Arius at the great council of Nice. This holy man, knowing that one of the principal ladies of the city lay extremely ill, told Helena, that they must carry the three crosses to the sick person, and beg of God that he would cure her by the application of the true cross. The empress and all the people being present, he touched the woman with two of the crosses ineffectually; but as soon as he had made use of the third, she arose in perfect

Protestants, will only esteem it so much the more.' Le Clerc, Bibl. A. et M. iii. p. 194.

The *pious ears* of the archbishop of Paris, and of other good souls, must have been offended at many free things said by Du Pin, and at the account which he gave of Cyril and of the council of Ephesus. Every intelligent reader will perceive that he had a bad opinion of this Father, and that he thought him an insolent man, and a miserable scribbler. He sets forth very fairly the objections which may be made to the conduct and the proceedings of the saint and of the council; and then he sets himself to remove and invalidate those objections, and he gives as good answers to them as could be given. If his defence was unsatisfactory (as it really is), how could he help it? Matters of fact are of a stubborn nature, and it was not in his power to annihilate them. He might, indeed, have *made* history, in the manner of *Varillas* and *Maimbourg*, and then he would have been in odour of sanctity, and have enjoyed the favour of his superiors.

health, and stronger than she had ever been. It is believed, says Sozomen, that they applied the cross to a dead body, which instantly revived. Saint Paulinus and Saint Sulpitius Severus mention only this last miracle.

'Helena, full of joy, adored, not the wood itself, says St. Ambrose, which would have been a Pagan folly, but the King of Heaven who suffered upon it. She took part of this treasure to carry to her son, and inclosing the rest in a silver box, she committed it to the bishop of Jerusalem. It was carefully kept in the church which was built there, and the bishop alone had the power to give little bits of it, which were considered as a singular favour and blessing. Saint Paulinus relates a *very singular thing* concerning that part of the cross which was at Jerusalem. This cross, says he, having a vital virtue in an insensible and inanimate substance, hath yielded and continues to yield almost daily its precious wood to the desires of an infinite number of persons, without suffering any diminution, continuing all the while as if it had been untouched[s]. It permits itself every day to be divided into several parts, and yet remains exposed entire to the veneration of the people.

'Saint Cyril of Jerusalem says only that the pieces of the cross were brought away from Jerusalem, and were spread all over the earth twenty-five years after.' H. E. vii. 5.

See more in Tillemont concerning the nails, the title which was upon the cross, the spear, the reed, the spunge, and the crown of thorns, part of which wrought miracles even so lately as in his time.

Here arises some difficulty, not whether the miracles were true or false, for as to that, all is clear enough, but whether the discovery of the cross was a fiction, made up some years after the death of Helena and of Constantine, or whether Helena really found a cross. This must remain a

[s] A man capable of affirming a fact so absurd and ridiculous, ought not to be cited and recommended to us as a good witness for miracles, but should be rejected with disdain, at least by Protestant divines. What pity is it that an ingenious, religious, charitable, and good-tempered prelate, as Paulinus was, gave into these godly fictions!

dubious point, though upon the whole it seems most probable that the story was invented by the Christians of Jerusalem after the emperor and his mother were dead.

The discovery in the time of Constantine rests principally upon the authority of Cyril of Jerusalem, the only witness who lived at that time, and who speaks of no miracles attending the discovery; and the question is whether the Epistle of Cyril, which mentions it, be genuine, or spurious, or interpolated, and also whether Cyril, supposing it genuine, made up that part of the story himself, and dated the discovery too early.

If Helena found a cross, it is impossible now to know how the fraud was conducted, and who were the actors in this godly knavery, the hiders, and the finders. Eusebius, who lived then, and was bishop of Cæsarea in the neighbourhood, says not a word of the cross, though he relates the discovery of the sepulchre of Christ, and mentions the magnificent church which was erected there, and names Macarius, as the person to whom the care of the building was committed. Vit. Const. iii. 25, &c. It is therefore to be concluded that either he knew nothing, or believed nothing of it. If the thing was really transacted as Socrates and others relate, one might conjecture that Eusebius chose to be silent, lest he should offend the family of Constantine, and say what the times would not bear.

'Neque crucis inventionem solus præterit Eusebius. Quod magis miramur, de ea nihil memorat Constantinus ipse, in sua ad Macarium Epistola, ubi Dei in laudes erumpit, ob repertum, quod tamdiu delituerat, sepulcrum Domini, *sacratissimum passionis ejus monumentum.* Quanto magis repertæ crucis meminisset? Non nescimus Bellarminum Constantini verba hæc accommodasse cruci. Sed intoleranda hæc est Bellarmini sive inscitia, sive audacia, quocunque nomine vocetur, dum ex sepulcro crucem fabricat. Inventæ crucis primus mentionem fecit Cyrillus, qui ea de re ad Constantium scripsit Augustum: *Ac tempore quidem Deo dilectissimi ac beatæ memoriæ Constantini patris tui, salutare crucis lignum Hierosolymis repertum est.* Cum autem illo tempore vixerit Cyrillus, quo Hierosolymam lustravit Helena, durum fortasse vide-

bitur, aut factum negare, aut Epistolam Cyrillo detrahere. Non dissimulabimus tamen in ea quæstione nos pendere animi. Urget Cyrilli ad Imperatorem Epistola qui commentis ludi non debuit. Dubium tamen animum multa faciunt. Primum de reperta cruce traditionis dissimilitudo. Dein altissimum Eusebii Constantinique de ea inventione silentium, &c. Denique fraus reliquiariorum nobis est timenda in rebus ejusmodi. Excogitatam esse crucis inventionem, partim ut pergratum fieret Constantio, qui reliquiis extra modum delectabatur, partim et ecclesiæ Hierosolymitanæ honos accumularetur, quid vetat? Nonne Juvenalis, Cyrilli de successoribus unus, per *commentitia scripta* Palæstinæ principatum extorquere voluit, docente Leone, Epist. 62. Hieronymus quidem Cyrillum[h] ejusmodi coloribus pingit in *Chronico*, quibus existimari forsan posset animum a piis fraudibus alienum non gestasse,' &c. S. Basnage, Ann. ii. 728, 9.

If Cyril of Jerusalem wrote these words, and vouched for the discovery of the true cross, he must, as to this particular, pass either for a *deceiver*, or for

'that tool,
Which wise men work with, call'd ——'

One would therefore willingly suppose that the letter ascribed to Cyril is spurious or interpolated.

The good woman Helena was near fourscore years old when she took this journey to Jerusalem. It is more probable that she should have been imposed upon, than that she should have had any share in the contrivance. As to Macarius, if what is here related of him be true, his blessedness must have been let into the secret.

Helena was sainted and highly honoured after her death: her body is said to be in an abbey in France, and also at Rome; but there is no great inconvenience to suppose it to be in two places at once. The multiplication of the cross, attested by Paulinus, leads us to this opinion. See Tillemont H. E. vii. 18.

The ecclesiastics of Jerusalem, at what time soever they

[h] See Sozom. iv. 25. vii. 7. Socrat. ii. 40. concerning the character of Cyril.

contrived the discovery of the cross, knew their own interest very well. It must have drawn a swarm of pious vagrants to their city, and have brought in great revenues to the church and to the bishop, if they gave only sixpence a piece to see the box in which the cross was locked up[i].

The finding of the cross hath been also ascribed to one Judas, a Jew (and a bad name), by Gregory of Tours. See the remarks of J. Basnage, Hist. des Juifs, vi. 14. § 10. p. 1243.

I know not why Basnage should affirm that this Gregory is the first of those who have spoken of the finding of the cross. p. 1244.

There is a passage of Eusebius on the Psalms, which hath been thought to refer to these miracles.

'Montfaucon conjectures that Eusebius composed this work after the year 327, in which those miracles were wrought that later authors have recorded concerning the discovery of the cross, and to which Eusebius seems to allude on Psalm lxxxvii. p. 549. where he speaks of miracles wrought in his time near the sepulchre of Jesus Christ, as also of the church which was built there by Helena, the mother of Constantine. It was not dedicated till the year 335. so that Eusebius must have composed his Commentary after that year. Yet in the Life of Constantine, where Eusebius speaks of this church, and describes very particularly, and with much pomp, the synod which was held there when the church was consecrated, he says nothing at all of it, though this was the most proper place to mention it. Montfaucon, however, persuades himself that Eusebius refers to these miracles in his Commentary on the Psalms. But one might as probably conclude that this passage in the Commentary was the interpolation of some copyist, at a time when no scruple was made to add to the writings of the antients, or to take away from them. If Eusebius had heard any thing of these miracles, is it to be

[i] Macrina, the sister of Gregory Nyssen, carried about her a little cross, and a ring in which a small bit of the true cross was enclosed. Vit. Macr.

supposed that he would have passed them over in a work made on purpose to celebrate Constantine and Helena? Was it an indifferent thing, and of no consequence, in the fourth century, whether mention should be made of the manner in which Helena found the true cross, and distinguished it from those of the thieves? No one will say it, or entertain so poor an opinion of the rhetoric of Eusebius, as to imagine that he could omit such an affair, if he knew it. His silence, therefore, will always be a stronger motive to reject what later authors have said upon this subject, than any argument that can be offered to the contrary, from an allusion which might so easily have been inserted by a forger into the Commentary of Eusebius on the Psalms, to support, by his authority, a fable invented afterwards.' Le Clerc, Bibl. A. et M. iv. p. 5.

AMONGST the Fathers who assisted at the Nicene Council, was Paphnutius, a venerable confessor and prelate. He was reported, says Socrates, to have wrought miracles; and indeed one would sooner believe it of him than of most of his contemporaries, since he was eminent both in prudence and in goodness. This historian hath transmitted to us a remarkable account of his antifanatical wisdom, by which he put a stop to a very absurd decree, which else might have passed in that general council.

'Paphnutius cujusdam urbis in superiori Thebaide fuit episcopus; vir adeo pius Deoque carus, ut admiranda ab eo signa ederentur. Huic persecutionis tempore oculus fuerat effossus. Imperator vero hominem magnopere observabat, et frequenter in palatium accersebat, effossumque ejus oculum deosculabatur. Visum erat episcopis novam legem inducere, ut quicumque in sacrum ordinem allecti essent, id est, episcopi, presbyteri, et diaconi, ab uxorum quas cum laici essent, matrimonii jure sibi sociaverant, concubitu abstinerent. Cumque hac re in medium proposita, singulorum sententiæ rogarentur, surgens in medio episcoporum concessu Paphnutius, vehementer vociferatus est, non esse imponendum clericis et sacerdotibus grave hoc jugum: honorabiles nuptias et torum immaculatum esse

dicens; ne ex nimia severitate damnum potius inferrent ecclesiæ. Neque enim omnes ferre posse tam districtæ continentiæ disciplinam; ac forsitan inde eventurum esse, ut cujusque uxoris castitas minime custodiretur. Castitatem autem vocabat congressum viri cum uxore legitima. Satis esse ut qui in clerum fuissent adscripti, juxta veterem ecclesiæ traditionem jam non amplius uxores ducerent: non tamen quemquam sejungendum esse ab ea quam antehac, tunc cum esset laicus, legitime duxisset. Atque hæc dixit, ipse non modo conjugii, sed muliebris congressus penitus expers; quippe qui a puero in monasterio educatus fuisset, et ob singularem castimoniam ab omnibus celebratus. Cæterum universus sacerdotum cœtus Paphnutii sermonibus assensus est. Proinde omissa ejus rei disceptatione, singulorum arbitrio permiserunt, ut ab uxorum consuetudine abstinerent, si vellent.' Socr. i. 11.

Baronius and Valesius would willingly set the account aside, for obvious reasons. Du Pin and Tillemont are more fair and candid. See Lowth on Socrates, and Tillemont, H. E. vi. p. 677.

This decree concerning the marriages of the clergy, even as it was modified by the wise Paphnutius, will seem overrigid to many; and for these, and several other reasons besides these, it is matter of some wonder how the church was supplied with a sufficient number of ecclesiastics. Who that loved peace and quiet, and could earn a morsel of bread any other way, would have chosen to travel year after year from Jerusalem to Jericho, from council to council, to live in perpetual disputes, jars, broils, and quarrels, censuring and censured, anathematizing and anathematized, and, if he happened to be on the wrong side of the question, sure to be banished and transported, at least to some *remote island*, if nothing worse ensued? Who would not say:

> 'Quod te per genium dextramque deosque penates
> Obsecro, et obtestor: vitæ me redde priori?'

THE COUNCIL of *Illiberis* is supposed by some to have been held in the time of Constantine, by others much earlier, and by Tillemont about A. D. 300.

This council excommunicated those who lent money upon interest, though the laws of the empire permitted it: but almost all the Fathers had wrong notions about interest, or usury, as also about self-defense, and bearing arms.

Instead of dissuading vows of virginity, it excommunicated those women who, after having made such rash and silly vows, entered into a state of matrimony. It also excommunicated those who should eat with a Jew. Tillemont, H. E. vii. 302.

'The council of Illiberis made two decrees against the Jews of Spain. In that country they had much commerce with the Christians: they ate together, and lived familiarly. The council forbad this intercourse under pain of excommunication for any one who should eat with a Jew. The punishment was violent, and inflicted *mal-à-propos*, since repasts are actions purely civil, and excommunication ought to be inflicted only for ecclesiastical offences. By another decree this council forbids the possessors of lands to permit the Jews to bless the fruits of the earth, because their benediction would render that of the Christians useless, and it threatens to drive out entirely from the church those who should disobey. The Jews in that country seem to have been tenants to the Christians. They carried the first fruits to the synagogue, or rather they had public prayers for the divine blessing on their grounds. The Spanish Jews have still in their ritual, a benediction which they pronounce for almonds, apricots, cider, and acorns. They request of God that he would send rain and dew upon the earth, and bless the fruits, seeds, &c. These are the blessings which the council of Illiberis hath condemned. It forbad the landlords to suffer them to be used by the tenants, fearing that the Jewish would cause the Christian benediction to be ineffectual. As if prayers addressed to the same God could prejudice each other, and those of the Jew could have a noxious influence on the petitions of the faithful!' Basnage Hist. des Juifs, vi. 14. § 8.

UNDER CONSTANTINE flourished Eusebius, the most learned bishop of that age, and the Father of Ecclesiastical

History, whom it were ingratitude to pass over slightly in a work of this kind.

Like the illustrious Origen, of whom he was very fond, he hath had warm friends and inveterate enemies, and the world hath ever been divided in judging of his theological sentiments:

Τυδείδην δ' οὐκ ἂν γνοίης, ποτέροισι μετείη,
Ἠὲ μετὰ Τρώεσσιν ὁμιλέοι, ἢ μετ' Ἀχαιοῖς.

The Arians and Unitarians have always laid claim to him, and of their opposers many have given him up, others have defended him; and in truth any party might be glad to have him on their side.

In the manuscripts of Eusebius, we find him perpetually censured and reviled in marginal notes by Greek scholiasts, and called Arian, Heretic, Blasphemer, Detestable Wretch, &c.

He was one of those bishops who judged that Arius had hard measure, and who wrote a letter in his behalf to Alexander of Alexandria. But he was a bad intercessor upon that occasion, and probably had very little interest with Alexander.

He was certainly no admirer of Athanasius, yet not an active and a violent adversary. He had the favour and friendship of Constantine, which he seems never to have used in depressing or hurting others, or in getting any thing for himself; and he refused to change his bishopric for a better.

He scrupled at first to admit the word ὁμοούσιος, because it was *unscriptural*; but afterwards, for the sake of peace and quiet, he complied with it in a sense which he gave to it, and which hath been mentioned above[k]. 'The use of unscriptural terms,' saith he, 'has been the cause of almost all the confusion and disturbance that hath happened in the church—ἀγράφοις χρήσασθαι φωναῖς· διὸ σχεδὸν ἡ πᾶσα γέγονε σύγχυσίς τε καὶ ἀκαταστασία τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν.' Apud Socr. i. 8. p. 26.

He seems to have been neither an Arian nor an Athana-

[k] p. 185.

sian, but one who endeavoured to steer a middle cours, yet inclining more to the Arians than to the Athanasians. When he died, Acacius succeeded him in the see of Cæsarea, a learned man, who had been his disciple, and his intimate friend, and who was of the Semiarian party. See a Life of Eusebius by Valesius, and another by Le Clerc, and Le Clerc's Ars Crit. vol. iii. and Bibl. A. et M. iv. 18. Fabricius B. G. v. 30. Du Pin B. E. ii. 1. Beausobre Hist. de Man. i. 545. Fleury H. E. xii. Tillemont, Cave, Montfaucon, and S. Basnage Ann. ii. 753. who, in his account of the Arian controversy, shows himself more favourable to the Consubstantialists than becomes an impartial historian.

Eusebius was very laborious and industrious, and must have spent much time and pains in reading, collecting, and digesting: but he seems to have bestowed little in forming a style, and in imitating the colour, manner, and diction of polite writers; his language is neither elegant nor perspicuous, and, where it aims at eloquence and sublimity, is usually turgid and perplexed.

Treating of the doctrine of the Trinity, he makes *this* remark: 'Our Saviour hath taught us what we ought to think concerning him, in order to obtain salvation:—God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever *believeth* in him may have life eternal. He says not, he who *knoweth* his nature, but he who *believeth* in him.' Contr. Marc. i. 12. p. 72.

In the 'Testimonia pro Eusebio,' collected by Valesius, we find the following censure:

'Meminimus in quodam libello Eusebii quondam egregii in reliquis viri legisse, quia nec Spiritus Sanctus sciat mysterium nativitatis Domini nostri Jesu Christi, et admiror tantæ doctrinæ virum hanc maculam Spiritui Sancto inflixisse.' Ex Libro Quæst. &c.

The writer of these *Questions* might not perhaps mean Eusebius of Cæsarea, but some other Eusebius. See Tillemont H. E. vii. 529.; and perhaps he mistook his author, whosoever that author was, who might say that the *evil spirit*, the devil, was ignorant of this mystery, as Ignatius affirms in one of his Epistles.

Eusebius compares the three sons of Constantine to the

Trinity. Οὕτω δὴ Τριάδος λόγῳ τριτὴν γονὴν παίδων θεοφιλῆ κτησάμενος.—'Ita cum ad quandam Trinitatis similitudinem tres filios Deo amabiles sustulisset.' Vit. Const. iv. 40. What was become of his judgment and discretion, when he wrote such things!

He observes that Christ left his body for a short space of time, to show that he was really dead, and reassumed it, to manifest his divine power.—Τὸ μὲν σῶμα πρὸς βραχὺ καταλιπών. Laud. Const. xv.

See how easy it is to fall into heterodoxy quite unawares! Eusebius thought not of giving offense by making this remark: but some wise *school-man* hath delivered it as an apophthegm; 'Quod Christus assumsit, nunquam dimisit.' And therefore we must bring Eusebius off as well as we can. Let Valesius plead his cause: 'Hæc benigna interpretatione adjuvanda sunt,' says he, 'Christus enim ne minimo quidem temporis puncto corpus suum reliquit. Quippe qui, ut vulgo dici solet, id quod semel assumsit, nunquam dimisit. Sed corpus suum animæ consortio destitui aliquantisper passus est.' An excellent distinction!

Eusebius calls Christ, τὸ φῶς τὸ προκόσμιον· E. H. i. 2. which Valesius translates, 'æternum lumen.' He should have rendered it, 'antemundanum lumen,' which, though not so elegant, is more exact. Eusebius could have said φῶς ἀΐδιον, if he had been so minded. He declares that the Son is Πατρὶ συμβασιλεύων ἐξ ἀνάρχων αἰώνων εἰς ἀπείρους καὶ ἀτελευτήτους αἰῶνας· 'reigns with his Father, from ages without beginning to ages without end.' Laud. Const. i. p. 719. And again; οὐ χρόνοις μέν τισιν οὐκ ὄντα, ὕστερον δέ ποτε γεγονότα, ἀλλὰ πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων ὄντα, καὶ πρόοντα, καὶ τῷ Πατρὶ ὡς υἱὸν διαπαντὸς συνόντα·—That is, 'There was not a time when he was not, or when he began to be, but he, as son, always coexisted with the Father.' Dem. Evang. iv. p. 149. And, in his Commentary on the Psalms, Τί οὖν φησι πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Κύριος, Ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε; δηλονότι περὶ τῆς χρονικῆς ἔφη γεννήσεως τῆς κατ' οἰκονομίαν· περὶ γὰρ τῆς ἀνάρχου φησὶν αὐτὸς ὁ Δαυίδ· ἐκ γαστρὸς πρὸ ἑωσφόρου ἐγέννησά σε. 'Cur igitur ait illi Dominus: *Ego hodie genui te?* Id videlicet de temporali generatione dictum, quæ per œco-

nomiam facta. De illa namque quæ sine principio est, ait ipse David: Ex utero ante luciferum genui te.' p. 15.

This looks like an acknowledgment of the *eternity* of the Son, and this was also the opinion of his master Origen, who says, Ὅτε δὲ τό· υἱός μου εἶ συ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε, λέγεται πρὸς αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ᾧ ἀεί ἐστι τὸ σήμερον, οὐκ ἔνι γὰρ ἑσπέρα Θεοῦ, ἐγὼ δὲ ἡγοῦμαι ὅτι οὐδὲ πρωΐα, ἀλλ' ὁ συμπαρεκτείνων τῇ ἀγεννήτῳ καὶ ἀϊδίῳ αὐτοῦ ζωῇ, ἵν' οὕτως εἴπω, χρόνος, ἡμέρα ἐστὶν αὐτῷ σήμερον, ἐν ᾗ γεγέννηται ὁ υἱός· ἀρχῆς γενέσεως αὐτοῦ οὕτως οὐχ εὑρισκομένης, ὡς οὐδὲ τῆς ἡμέρας.—' Sed tum cum, *Filius meus es tu, ego hodie genui te*, dicitur ad illum a Deo, cui semper est hodie, neque enim est vespera Dei, neque mane, meo quidem judicio, sed tempus (ut ita dicam) simul se extendens cum illa ipsius ingenita et sempiterna vita ipsi dies est hodie, in qua genitus est Filius; sic non invento originis ipsius principio sicut neque diei.' Comm. in Joan. p. 31. See more to the same purpose in Huetius, Origenian. p. 44. &c. Origen admitted also the eternity of the world, or of various beings eternally derived from God, and dependent upon him, and owing their existence to his will and power. This opinion was most generally received by the philosophers, and some Christians, perhaps, adopted it. But Origen proposed it rather as a philosophical problem, than as a doctrine. Origenian. p. 167, &c.

Eusebius says, that when the *Word* condescended to become man, his divinity was not impaired by it, but he was every where present, filling all things and ruling all things, οὐδὲ ἀποπεσὼν τῆς θεότητος. Dem. Evang. p. 169.

He observes that all things owe their existence and their perfections to the *Word*, and to the *Holy Spirit*; that the *Word* called even the angels into being; and that the *Holy Spirit* at the same time illuminated and sanctified them. Ἀγγέλων γοῦν τὴν μὲν εἰς τὸ εἶναι πάροδον ὁ δημιουργὸς Λόγος ὁ ποιητὴς τῶν ὅλων παρείχετο· τὸν ἁγιασμὸν δὲ αὐτοῖς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον συνεπέφερεν. Com. in Psalm. p. 125.

He says of Christ, E. H. i. 2.---ὡσανεὶ τοῦ Πατρὸς ὑπάρχοντα δύναμιν καὶ σοφίαν [ἰσοκλεῆ] καὶ τὰ δευτερεῖα τῆς

κατὰ πάντων βασιλείας τε καὶ ἀρχῆς ἐμπεπιστευμένον·— 'ut Patris virtutem ac sapientiam, *honore ipsi æqualem*, et in regno ac principatu omnium rerum secundum locum obtinentem.'

Here Valesius, as a fair and judicious critic, shuts out of the text ἰσοκλεῆ, which was not in his manuscripts, and is a most manifest interpolation; and yet inserts in his translation, 'honore ipsi æqualem,' for reasons which one may easily guess. This was what he ought not to have done, and what would deceive several of his readers.

I say nothing of 'obtinentem,' which yet expresses not ἐμπεπιστευμένον. Ἐμπιστεύομαι is, 'I have a thing intrusted and committed to me.'

H. E. iii. 6. Τοιαῦτα τῆς Ἰουδαίων εἰς τὸν Χριστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ παρανομίας τε καὶ δυσσεβείας τἀπίχειρα. Valesius translates; 'Igitur Judæorum scelus atque impietatem adversus *Deum* Jesum Christum hujusmodi ultio consecuta est.'

Eusebius, to be sure, was very willing to call Christ Θεὸς, and hath given him that title a hundred times; but he has not called him so here. He calls him αὐτόθεον, X. iv. p. 468. that is 'verum Deum,' or, 'naturâ Deum;' not, as Valesius renders it, 'per se Deum.' Neither Eusebius, nor indeed any of the Nicene Fathers, would have called Christ αὐτόθεον, in the sense of 'Self-existing,' or 'First Cause.' See the notes there. Οὐδὲ δύο θεοὺς ἀνάγκη δοῦναι τὸν τὰς δύο ὑποστάσεις τιθέντα· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἰσοτίμους αὐτὰς ὁριζόμεθα, οὐδ' ἄμφω ἀνάρχους καὶ ἀγεννήτους· ἀλλὰ μίαν μὲν, τὴν ἀγέννητον καὶ ἄναρχον· θατέραν δὲ γεννητὴν, καὶ ἀρχὴν τὸν πατέρα κεκτημένην. Διὸ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ υἱὸς, καὶ ἑαυτοῦ εἶναι θεὸν τὸν αὐτοῦ πατέρα διδάσκει ἐν οἷς φησι, Ἀνέρχομαι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου καὶ πατέρα ὑμῶν καὶ Θεὸν μου καὶ Θεὸν ὑμῶν.—Ὁ δὲ υἱὸς, ὅτε μὲν αὐτὸς παραβάλλεται τῷ πατρὶ, οὐκ ἔτ' ἔσται καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ πατρὸς Θεὸς, ἀλλ' υἱὸς μονογενὴς καὶ ἀγαπητὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου, καὶ ἀπαύγασμα τῆς πατρικῆς δόξης· σέβει τε καὶ προσκυνεῖ καὶ δοξάζει τὸν ἑαυτοῦ πατέρα, Θεὸν αὐτὸν καὶ ἑαυτοῦ ἐπιγραφόμενος. De Eccl. Theol. xi. 7. Thus rendered by Dr. Clarke:

'It is not necessary that he who acknowledges the Father and the Son to be two distinct subsistencies, should

say that there are two Gods: for we do not look upon them as two co-ordinate persons, both of them underived and unbegotten; but one unbegotten and underived, the other begotten and derived from the Father. Wherefore the Son also himself teaches us, that his Father is even *His* God also, [as well as ours;] when he says I ascend unto my Father and your Father, unto *my* God and *your* God.——But now on the other side, the Son, when he is compared with the Father, cannot be said to be the God of his Father, but his only-begotten and beloved *Son*, and the *image* of the invisible God, and the *brightness* of his Father's glory; and honours and worships and glorifies his Father, calling him even *his* God also, [as well as *ours*.']

'Christus Eusebio dicitur αὐτόθεος, *ipse Deus*, *et* ἀληθινὸς Θεὸς, *verus Deus*, scilicet comparate ad homines, qui aliquando Dii appellantur: nam comparate ad Patrem, sive Deum universorum, non vere et proprie Deus dicitur, secundum Eusebii sententiam.

'Ait Filium πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων et πρὸ πάντων αἰώνων, id est, ante sæcula, productum: nam sæcula et tempus omne cum mundo cœpisse cum multis aliis veteribus arbitratur, nec vox αἰώνιος apud Eusebium, pro æternitate ante creationem usquam sumitur: nam hujusmodi æternitatem in Filio evidenter negat.' Montfaucon Prælim. ad Euseb. in Psalmos. p. 24.

He says of Christ, πρωτείοις μὲν τῆς τῶν ὅλων ἀρχῆς, ΙΣΟΙΣ δὲ τῆς πατρικῆς βασιλείας ἐνδοξαζόμενος· 'qui prærogativam quidem honoris obtinet principatum universi: æqualem autem cum Patre gloriam in Patris possidet regno.' Laud. Const. i. p. 719.

Here Valesius translates the text as it stands in the copies, for which he is not to be blamed; and, as a fair commentator, observes in his notes that ἴσοις must have been thrust in by some transcriber, and that Eusebius wrote δευτερείοις. 'In gubernatione quidem universi Filium ait principem locum obtinere: in regno autem Patris secundum.' The emendation is unquestionably right, and the reasons which Valesius gives for it are unanswerable. It is not the business of a critic, or an editor, to make his author more or less orthodox than he was.

In Socrates ii. 37. Valesius has twice 'Deum et Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum,' where there is no 'Deum' in the text, and where they who speak are Arian bishops.

Eusebius: Ἤδη γοῦν ὅλην Χριστιανῶν πολίχνην αὐτανδρον ἀμφὶ τὴν Φρυγίαν ἐν κύκλῳ περιβαλόντες ὁπλῖται, πῦρ τε ὑφάψαντες, κατέφλεξαν αὐτοὺς ἅμα νηπίοις καὶ γυναιξὶ, τὸν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸν Χριστὸν ἐπιβοωμένους. 'Certe urbem quandam Christianorum in Phrygia milites armati obsidione cinxerunt, injectoque igne totam una cum viris et mulieribus ac parvulis *Christum omnium Deum* invocantibus concremarunt.' viii. 11.

The phrase, τὸν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸν Χριστὸν, is very remarkable; but as it is a manner of speaking which Eusebius hath never used in any other place, and which he has expressly condemned, I believe it should be, τὸν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸν ΚΑΙ Χριστὸν ἐπιβοωμένους, 'supremum Deum et Christum invocantes:' or, ΚΑΙ ΤΟΝ Χριστὸν—as De Mart. Pal. viii. οὓς τὸν τῶν ὅλων Θεὸν, ΚΑΙ τὸν Χριστὸν ὁμολογήσαντας. Ib. i. μόνον ἕνα Θεον, ΚΑΙ μόνον Χριστὸν βασιλέα Ἰησοῦν ὁμολογήσαντες. viii. 10. τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ὅμμα πρὸς τὸν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸν καθαρῶς τείναντες—τὸν μὲν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν——And in many other places which it is needless to cite.

These are not words taken down by some by-stander, but the expressions of the historian, describing Christian martyrs, men, women, and children, all praying and dying together; and therefore we must expect to find the usual language and style of Eusebius.

See Dr. Clarke *Script. Doct.* N°. 539., who says, 'All which, by the way, clearly shows that the single passage in Eusebius's account of the Phrygian martyrs who are represented as invocating Christ, τὸν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸν, 'the God over all,' must needs have been interpolated with the word *Christ*, as being directly contrary to Eusebius's whole writings in a point which he hath particularly and largely considered.'

I agree with him, that the place wants emendation, but I think my conjecture is much more probable.

Laud. Const. i.—Τὴν Χριστοῦ βασιλείαν ὁμολογοῦσι—πρὸς τὸν Κύριον γενομένους.—Valesius:—'regnum *Dei* con-

fitentes—cum ad *Deum* pervenissent.' De Martyr. Palæst. vii. He should have translated it, *Christi*, and *Dominum*.

Eusebius says of the Λόγος;—τῇ τοῦ Πατρὸς καθωσιώμενος τιμῇ.

'Male interpres vertit, *dignitatis paternæ particeps*, cum vertendum esset, *devotus ac dicatus cultui Patris*. Similis est inscriptio illa, quæ in basi statuarum quas imperatoribus dicaverant, vulgo legitur, DEVOTVS NVMINI MAIESTATIQVE EIVS. Cæterum hæc Arianum dogma sapiunt.' So Valesius, who translates the place rightly.

Laud. Const. vi. p. 729. Ενθένδε οὖν τῷ τοῦ παντὸς ἐνιαυτοῦ κύκλῳ, τοιαῖσδε σοφίας ἡνίαις ὁ μέγας βασιλεὺς ὧδε περιδησάμενος τὸν αὐτοῦ αἰῶνα, ὑπὸ MEIZONI φέρεσθαι διετάξατο κυβερνήτῃ, τῷ αὐτοῦ μονογενεῖ λόγῳ, τῷ δὴ κοινῷ τῶν ὅλων σωτῆρι, τὰς τοῦ παντὸς παραδοὺς ἡνίας. 'Ad hunc modum summus omnium imperator, cum ævum suum totius anni circulo hujusmodi divinæ sapientiæ habenis adstrinxisset, *præstantissimo* moderatori illud regendum tradidit, unigenito scilicet verbo, cui, utpote communi omnium rerum conservatori, hujus universi habenas commisit.' Where Valesius says;

'*Majorem* appellat Filium, non quidem ipso Patre, sed reliquis omnibus majorem intelligens. Ac fortasse suspicetur quispiam ab Eusebio scriptum esse ὑπὸ μείονι.

It is possible that μείζονι is the interpolation of some transcriber, who was offended at the word μείονι; but yet Eusebius might have said μείζονι, in the sense given to it by Valesius, and therefore it is not necessary to alter the text.

E. H. vii. 19. Τὸν γὰρ Ἰακώβου θρόνον—εἰς δεῦρο πεφυλαγμένον οἱ τῇδε κατὰ διαδοχὴν περιέποντες ἀδελφοί·—'Sane et Jacobi cathedram—ad nostra usque tempora conservatam fratres illius ecclesiæ jam inde a majoribus *magna prosequuntur reverentia*.'

Here Valesius, in *reverence* to this *old elbow-chair*, and to holy reliques, chose rather to increase than to lessen the force of the expression περιέποντες. Περιέπειν is, 'to take good care of any thing, diligenter custodire et curare.'

Eusebius, in his first book against Marcellus, makes

mention of the Trinity, calling the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, τὴν ἁγίαν καὶ μακαρίαν καὶ μυστικὴν Τριάδα, 'the holy, and blessed, and mystical Trinity.' So likewise, in his Epistle to Flaccillus, p. 57. and in the Præp. Evang. xi. Clemens Alexandrinus also says—τὴν ἁγίαν Τριάδα, apud Euseb. Præp. Ev. xiii. 13. and Origen vi. tom. in Joan. προσκυνητὴν Τριάδα.

It hath been observed, that 'Theophilus Antiochenus, who lived in the second century, is the first in whose writings the word Trinity is used for the Father, Son, and Spirit.' Αἱ τρεῖς ἡμέραι — τύποι εἰσι τῆς Τριάδος, τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Λόγου αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῆς Σοφίας αὐτοῦ. Ad Autol. xi. 15.

Eusebius censures Marcellus for teaching that the body of Jesus Christ should cease to exist after the day of judgment. This is a question which, methinks, neither Marcellus nor Eusebius should have pretended to meddle with and to decide.

'Father Simon hath made some remarks upon the *Præparatio* and the *Demonstratio Evangelica* of Eusebius, and upon the editions which we have of those books. He commends the edition of the *Præparatio* by Vigerus the Jesuit, which indeed is the best and the most faithful. Yet there are some passages where this translator softens the Arianism of Eusebius. See l. vii. 12. and compare this version with the original. The *Demonstratio* is not so well translated, and it is by another hand, by Donatus of Verona, who hath accommodated Eusebius to his own notions, of which disingenuity a specimen may be seen l. v. 3. in the Argument, where Eusebius says, word for word, 'That the same prophet in Psalm cix. acknowledges clearly two Lords; the one who is the first and the supreme God; the second whom he himself calls his Lord,' &c. The Latin interpreter, instead of this, translates, 'That the prophet evidently twice acknowledges the Lord; once when he speaks of him who is God and Father, and secondly, when he speaks of him whom he himself calls his Lord.' In the Greek it is, δύο Κυρίους ἐμφανῶς ὁμολογεῖ· ἕνα τὸν πρῶτον καὶ ἀνωτάτω Θεὸν· δεύτερον, ὃν αὐτὸς ἑαυτοῦ ἀναγορεύει Κύριον.

'Eusebius endeavours afterwards to prove this doctrine, in his books of *Ecclesiastical Theology*, and against Marcellus of Ancyra, who was, if we consider it well, very nearly of the same sentiments which Christians at present entertain.

'I am surprised that there should be persons who pretend to deny that Eusebius was an Arian, if they have perused those books. It would be an insincerity, which would give one a very bad opinion of their probity. I had rather believe that they never examined those books, or never in the original.' Le Clerc, Bibl. A. et M. i. 169.

It is true that in a multitude of places he establishes the preeminence of the Father[k]; but in other respects he endeavoured to set the dignity of the Λόγος very high, as it appears from the expressions which I have cited, and I gathered as many as I could find.

The passages in Eusebius which Le Clerc produces, to show that he was an Arian, are these: Οὐ γὰρ συνυπάρχειν φαμὲν τὸν Υἱὸν τῷ Πατρὶ, προϋπάρχειν δὲ τὸν Πατέρα τοῦ Υἱοῦ· ἐὰν γὰρ συνυπάρχωσι, πῶς ἔσται ὁ Πατὴρ πατὴρ, καὶ ὁ Υἱὸς υἱός; ἢ πῶς ὁ μὲν πρῶτος, ὁ δὲ δεύτερος; ὁ μὲν ἀγέννητος, ὁ δὲ γεννητός; δύο γὰρ ἐξ ἴσου ὁμοίως ἀλλήλοις συνυπάρχοντα ἰσότιμα ἂν νοοῖντο· καὶ ἤτοι ἄμφω, ὡς ἔφην, ἀγέννητα, ἢ ἑκάτερα γεννητά. ἀλλ' οὐδέτερον τούτων ἀληθές. οὔτε γὰρ τὸ ἀγέννητον, οὔτε τὸ γεννητὸν ἂν εἴη· ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν πρῶτον καὶ κρεῖττον καὶ τάξει καὶ τιμῇ τοῦ δευτέρου ἡγεῖται, ὡς ἂν καὶ τοῦ εἶναι, καὶ τοῦ τοιῶσδε εἶναι τῷ δευτέρῳ αἴτιον γεγενημένον. 'Non enim coëxistere Filium Patri, sed ante fuisse Patrem, quam Filium, dicimus. Nam si coëxistunt, quomodo erit Pater pater, et Filius filius? Vel quomodo unus quidem primus, alter vero secundus est? et alter quidem ingenitus, alter autem genitus? Duo quippe si ex æquo similiter coëxistunt, et æqualiter honorantur; intelligi datur aut utrumque, ut

[k] In which he followed Origen, who declared himself of this opinion on all occasions. See the Origeniana of Huetius. 'Inter Christianos doctores, qui ante Nicænam floruerunt synodum, multi de Trinitatis mysterio parum caute locuti sunt,' &c. p. 36. Petavius says the same.

dixi, ingenitum, aut utrumque genitum esse. Sed neutrum eorum verum: neque enim essent ingenitum, et genitum; sed unum quidem primum et præstantius, et ordine et honore, secundum antecedit; quippe quod causa fuit secundo et existendi et ita existendi.'

Eusebius goes on:

Τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ καὶ μόνον ἀληθινὸν εἶναι διδάσκει δι' ὧν φησιν· ἵνα γινώσκωσί σε τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεόν. οὐχὶ ὡς ἑνὸς ὄντος μόνου τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀλλ' ὡς ἑνὸς ὄντος μόνου ἀληθινοῦ Θεοῦ, μετὰ προσθήκης ἀναγκαιοτάτης τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ. ἐπεὶ καὶ αὐτὸς Θεὸς μὲν ὁ Υἱός, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀληθινὸς Θεὸς· εἷς γάρ ἐστι καὶ μόνος ἀληθινὸς Θεὸς, διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν πρὸ αὐτοῦ τινά. εἰ δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Υἱὸς ἀληθινὸς, ἀλλ' ὡς εἰκὼν τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ Θεοῦ εἴη ἂν καὶ Θεὸς· ἐπεὶ καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος, οὐ μὲν ὡς ὁ μόνος ἀληθινὸς Θεός. 'Eundem autem et solum verum esse docet, per ea quæ ait: *ut sciant te solum verum Deum*; non quasi unus solus sit Deus, sed quia unus est *verus Deus*, cum additamento pernecessario *veri*. Nam et ipse quidem Filius Deus, sed non *verus Deus*; unus enim est et solus, *verus Deus*, eo quod non habeat ante se quemquam. Quod si et ipse Filius *verus* est, at sicut imago veri Dei, erit Deus, quandoquidem *et Deus erat ratio*, non tamen ut solus verus Deus.' Epist. ad Euphrat.

In his Epistle to Alexander of Alexandria, in behalf of the Arians, he says:

Καὶ κατηγορεῖ αὐτῶν τὰ γράμματα, ὡς λεγόντων, ὅτι ὁ Υἱὸς ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος γέγονεν ὡς εἷς τῶν πάντων. οἱ δὲ προήγεγκαν ἑαυτῶν γραμματεῖον, ὃ πρὸς σε πεποιήκασιν· ἐν ᾧ τὴν ἑαυτῶν πίστιν ἐκθέμενοι αὐτοῖς ῥήμασι τάδε ὡμολόγουν· τοῦ νομοῦ, καὶ προφητῶν καὶ καινῆς διαθήκης Θεὸν γεννήσαντα Υἱὸν μονογενῆ πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων, δι' οὗ καὶ τοὺς αἰῶνας καὶ τὰ πάντα πεποίηκε, γεννήσαντα δὲ οὐ δοκήσει, ἀλλὰ ἀληθείᾳ ὑποστήσαντα ἰδίῳ θελήματι ἄτρεπτον καὶ ἀναλλοίωτον, ΚΤΙΣΜΑ τοῦ Θεοῦ τέλειον, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς ἓν τῶν κτισμάτων. εἰ δὲ οὖν τὰ παρ' αὐτῶν γράμματα ἀληθεύει, πάντως δὴ παρὰ σοὶ φέρεται. ἐν ᾧ ὁμολογοῦσι τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων, δι' οὗ καὶ τοὺς αἰῶνας πεποίηκεν, εἶναι ἄτρεπτον, καὶ κτίσμα τοῦ Θεοῦ τέλειον, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς ἓν τῶν κτισμάτων. ἡ δὲ σὴ ἐπιστολὴ κατηγορεῖ αὐτῶν ὡς ἂν λεγόντων ὅτι ὁ Υἱὸς γέγονεν ὡς ἓν τῶν κτισμάτων· αὐτῶν

τοῦτο μὴ λεγόντων, ἀλλὰ σαφῶς διορισαμένων ὅτι οὐχ ὡς ἓν τῶν κτισμάτων· ὅρα εἰ μὴ εὐθὺς πάλιν αὐτοῖς ἀφορμὴ δίδοται εἰς τὸ ἐπιλαβέσθαι καὶ διαβάλλειν ὁρμᾶσθαι ὅσα καὶ θέλουσι. πάλιν αὐτοῦς ἠτιῶ λέγοντας ὅτι ὁ ὢν τὸν μὴ ὄντα ἐγέννησε. θαυμάζω δὲ εἰ δύναταί τις ἄλλως εἰπεῖν. εἰ γὰρ εἷς ἐστιν ὁ ὤν, δῆλον ὅτι ἐξ αὐτοῦ γέγονε πᾶν ὅ, τι καὶ ἔστι μετ' αὐτόν. εἰ δὲ μὴ μόνος αὐτος ἐστιν ὁ ὤν, ἀλλὰ καὶ Υἱὸς ἦν ὁ ὤν, καὶ πῶς τὸν ὄντα ὁ ὢν ἐγέννησεν; οὕτως γὰρ ἂν δύο εἴη τὰ ὄντα. 'Accusant eos literæ tuæ tanquam dicentes *Filium ex non existentibus factum esse, sicut unum ex omnibus.* At illi protulerunt epistolam quam ad te dederant, in qua fidem suam explicantes, ipsis verbis hæc confitebantur, *Legis ac prophetarum et Novi Testamenti Deum genuisse Filium unigenitum, ante tempora mundi, per quem et omnia et mundum fecit; genuisse autem eum non specie tenus sed vere subsistentem, propria voluntate, immutabilem et inconvertibilem,* CREATVRAM *Dei perfectam, sed non sicut unam ex creaturis.* Si ergo literæ ipsorum vera profitentur, scriptum omnino apud te etiam eorum fertur, in quo confitentur *Filium Dei ante tempora mundi, per quem et mundum fecit, esse immutabilem, et creaturam Dei perfectam, sed non ut unam creaturarum*; tua vero epistola eos insimulat, quasi dicentes Filium factum fuisse *sicut unam creaturarum*; cum hoc non dixerint, sed clare definierint, *non esse instar unius creaturarum.* Vide annon protinus illis occasio detur adgrediendi, reprehendendi, et calumniandi quæcunque voluerint. Iterum eos accusabas dicentes, *ab eo qui erat genitum esse eum qui non erat.* Mirum si quis aliter dicere possit. Si enim unus est qui erat, manifestum est ex eo fuisse quicquid est post eum. Si autem ille solus non est qui erat, sed et Filius etiam erat, quomodo existentem is qui erat genuit? Sic fuissent duo quæ erant.'

Ὁ ὢΝ τὸν ΜΗ᾽ ὌΝΤΑ ἐγέννησε, says Eusebius, with the Arians. The question is, what he means by Ὁ ὢΝ, whether the *Self-existing*, or the *Eternal.* If he mean the *Eternal*, he denies the *past eternity* of the Son; if only the *Self-existing*, he only denies his *Self-existence.*

Le Clerc charges him with shuffling in this controversy, and screening his Arianism under ambiguities: but why

had not Eusebius as good a right to interpret the ὁμοούσιος for himself, as Athanasius, or Alexander, or other persons had, to put their sense upon it? The disputants were engaged in a νυκτομαχία, a *night-skirmish*, as Socrates justly calls it, and Eusebius seems to have been willing to comply with the Consubstantialists as far as he could, and to interpret the Nicene creed in such a manner as to make it acceptable to the Arians; and the difference, at that time, between the two parties, was of such a kind that it was not easy to be exactly determined.

Le Clerc had a dispute with Cave, whom he charged with writing the Lives of the Fathers like a panegyrist, and not as an impartial historian, and with vindicating the orthodoxy of Eusebius, who, as Cave said, was a Consubstantialist, and, as Le Clerc affirmed, was an Arian. Amongst other things, Le Clerc complains that certain divines were far more favourable to the antient fathers than to modern writers, and would excuse in the former what they would condemn in the latter; and in this there was too much truth. If any one had said to those patrons of Eusebius, You affirm that Eusebius was orthodox, and I grant it: will you then permit me to use the same language, and to speak upon the subject as he did? certain I am that he could not have obtained their consent, or escaped their severest censures and indignation.

'Although Eusebius made no difficulty to acknowledge in the Nicene council, that the Son of God was before all ages, and clearly rejected the impiety of Arius, who said that he was made out of nothing, and that there was a time when he was not, yet was he very unwilling to admit the word *Consubstantial*, that is, to acknowledge that the Son is of the same substance with the Father; and when he assented to this word, he gave it a sense which will not establish the coëquality of the Son, since in a letter which he wrote to his own church, to give them an account of his conduct, he speaks thus: "When it is said that the Son is *consubstantial* with the Father, the meaning is only that the Son hath no resemblance to the creatures which were made by him, but hath a perfect resemblance to his Father, of whom he was begotten, and not from any other hypostasis or substance."—If one might justify Eusebius

concerning the divinity of the Son, yet it would be difficult to defend his notions concerning the Holy Ghost: for in his *Præparatio*, and *Demonstratio*, and *Eccles. Theol.* he affirms that he is not truly God. "The Holy Spirit," says he, "is neither God nor Son of God, because he hath not his origin from the Father, like the Son, but is of the number of the things which have been made by the Son." This shows that Socrates, Sozomen, and some modern writers, have in vain endeavoured to excuse him entirely, and on the other hand that it is a great injustice to call him Arian, and head of the Arians, as Jerom hath done.—Eusebius was not author of any new formularies of faith; he conducted no intrigues to ruin Athanasius and his partizans: he would much rather have been instrumental in pacifying and re-uniting the two parties. I doubt not but that his many amiable qualities caused him to be set down in the number of saints in some antient martyrologies. It is true that he hath not remained in quiet possession of this title; but in my opinion it were a temerity to judge him absolutely unworthy of it.' Du Pin.

Eusebius testifies that in his time there were some slender remains of miraculous gifts and powers. Speaking of the miracles of Christ, believed by Christians upon sufficient evidence, he adds, ἐξήτασται παρ' ἡμῖν καὶ βεβασάνισται καὶ δι' ἑτέρων πραγμάτων ἐναργῶν—δι' ὧν αὐτὸς ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν εἰσέτι καὶ νῦν οἷς ἂν κρίνειεν, μικρά τινα τῆς αὐτοῦ δυνάμεως παραφαίνειν εἴωθε. 'Exquisita sane hæc a nobis exploratæque sunt, aliis quoque evidentibus rebus—quibus ipse Dominus noster etiam nunc iis quos dignos putaverit, exigua quædam suæ virtutis signa ostendere consueverit.' Dem. Ev. iii. p. 109.

Τίς δὲ οὐκ οἶδεν ὅπως σὺν αὐτῇ τῇ τοῦ Ιησοῦ προσηγορίᾳ, καὶ σὺν εὐχαῖς καθαρωτάταις πᾶν τὸ δαιμόνων ἔργον ἀπελαύνειν ἡμῖν φίλον ἐστίν;—εἰσέτι δεῦρο πᾶς δαίμων καὶ πᾶν ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα, ὥς τι τῶν κολαστικῶν καὶ βασανιστικῶν τῆς οἰκείας φύσεως, τοῦ Ιησοῦ τὸ ὄνομα φρίττει, ὑπεξίσταταί τε καὶ παραχωρεῖ τῇ τῆς προσηγορίας δυνάμει. 'Quis autem ignorat nostræ esse consuetudinis, ipso Jesu nomine, et purissimis precibus omnem dæmonum vexationem abigere?—Hodie quoque omnis dæmon, omnisque impurus spiritus ita Jesu nomen exhorret, ut unum aliquid eorum

quæ ipsius naturam castigandi ac torquendi vim habeat, auferque se illico, et concedit: tantam sentit illius nominis vim.' Dem. Ev. iii. p. 132.

'Constantia, the sister of Constantine, wrote to Eusebius, to desire him to send her a certain image, which was supposed to be the image of Jesus Christ; for Eusebius himself tells us, that in his time there were to be seen pictures of our Saviour, of St. Peter, and of St. Paul, and that he had seen at Paneas a statue of Christ, which the woman was said to have erected who had been cured by him of a bloody-flux. Eusebius returned an answer to Constantia, of which we have only some fragments remaining. It appears that he would not send it to her; but as to the reasons for his refusal, it is not easy to comprehend the solidity of them. All that can be said is, that he endeavours to take her off from contemplating the human nature of Christ, and to induce her rather to consider his divinity. But he seems to go so far as to say that his humanity had ceased after his ascent into heaven, and he hath been accused of entertaining this opinion.

'The enemies of holy images have made use of this letter, and they who have refuted them have allowed it to be genuine, but maintain that it was of no authority and weight, as coming from an Arian. It is certain that Eusebius seems not much to approve the use of images; and yet himself gives us reason to think that God approved of them, when he speaks of the miracles which were said to be wrought by the statue of Christ that was at Paneas; for he dares not maintain that what was related concerning it was false.' Tillemont, H. E. vii. 43.

Eusebius relates the story of the statue at Paneas as an historian, and gives it with an ἔλεγον, as a thing generally believed. He adds, for the sake of those who had ears to hear, that the Gentiles, who received miraculous favours from Christ or from his apostles, might, in all probability, have honoured their benefactors by making statues and pictures of them, ἀπαραφυλάκτως, ἐθνικῇ συνηθείᾳ, 'indiscreetly and according to Pagan custom;' which shows that he was no friend to holy images and to image-worship, and that he foresaw the bad use which would soon be

made of these representations. E. H. vii. 18. See also S. Basnage, Ann. i. 307.

Nicephorus reviles Eusebius as an enemy to holy images, as an Arian, and worse than an Arian, on account of this wicked letter of his to Constantia. Le Clerc, Bibl. A. et M. xxiv. 3.

'The second general council of Constantinople, assembled by Constantine, whom the image-mongers impudently called *Copronymus*, had condemned images, and had made use of a passage from the history of the apostle St. John by Leucius, of which here is the substance:

'A Christian, called Lycomedes, had got a portrait made of this apostle, who seeing a picture in the house of his disciple, and not knowing whom it represented, said to Lycomedes, What is the meaning of this image, and for whom of your gods is it made? I see that you have not yet entirely renounced the customs of the Gentiles. Lycomedes answered, I acknowledge only one God, namely, him who hath restored life to me and to my wife. But if, after that God, one may call *Gods* those good men who are our benefactors, you yourself are *the* God whom that image represents. It is you whom I crown, it is you whom I love, and whom I honour, as the faithful guide who hath conducted me to the source of all blessings. You banter me, my son, said St. John, you are not in earnest, and you cannot make me believe that this is my picture. Then Lycomedes having reached a looking-glass, gave it to St. John, who discerning his own countenance, and comparing it with the picture: As the Lord liveth said he, it is true that this image resembles me; but, my son, you have done a wrong thing.

'The bishops of the second Nicene council inveigh, as we may suppose, against the author of this relation, and against those who had dared to make use of it. And indeed the witness was good for nothing; he was a heretic and an impostor. But as to the story itself, there is nothing in it contrary to the apostolical spirit, or to the faith and practice of the antient church. If it be not true, it carries no small appearance of truth, and nothing brings

it into suspicion but the relater. That is more than can be said of a heap of authorities and testimonies urged by these Nicene bishops, where the facts are evidently false, the books certainly spurious, and the authors most impudent and audacious liars. This will appear a little rough, but it is very true, and there is no occasion to use any ceremony with such disingenuous and dishonest men.' Beausobre, Hist. de Man. i. 389. See also Fleury, H. E. t. ix. p. 543.

Eusebius subjoined to his Ecclesiastical History, an *Oration* of *Constantine*. It was composed in Latin by the emperor, and translated into Greek by a very bad hand. It is also full of faults: 'tot mendis inquinata est,' says Valesius, 'ut pene satius fuerit eam non extare.'

The Pagans, says Constantine in this Oration, may be convinced of the divinity of Jesus Christ, εἴπερ τοῖς ἑαυτῶν λόγοις πιστεύωσιν. 'Si quidem suorum *sermonibus* fidem velint adhibere.'

He appeals to the testimony of the Erythræan Sibyl, and therefore I believe it should be—τοῖς ἑαυτῶν λογίοις—'if they will give credit to their own *oracles*.' c. 18.

THUS much concerning Eusebius; to which it may be proper to join a few remarks on the ecclesiastical historians who are his usual companions, Socrates, Sozomen, &c.

'Reading, in his edition of the ecclesiastical historians, has joined to the notes of Valesius such observations of modern authors as he had picked up here and there. They might as well have been placed at the end of the book, since they are much inferior to those of Valesius, both for style and matter, and appear with the same disadvantage as an ordinary painting placed by the work of an eminent master.

'Valesius dedicated his work to the clergy of France, from whom he had a pension. He was sadly afraid of offending *certain persons*, who hold this maxim, That when an opinion serves to support a good cause, it may be piously believed, and it must not be attacked, be it ever so false and foolish.' Le Clerc Bibl. A. et M. t. xvi. The misfortune is, that these *certain persons* are to be found, and

to be felt, not only in the church of Rome, but every where else.

Socrates was born early in the fifth century, and educated at Constantinople. He professed the law, and pleaded at the bar, and thence was called *Scholasticus*, the name which was then given to advocates. He wrote an Ecclesiastical History with much accuracy and judiciousness, and with much plainness and simplicity of style, avoiding all rhetorical flourishes. He is suspected by some of having been a Novatian; but Valesius defends him, and acquits him of the charge, Vit. Socr. Yet he certainly entertained a very favourable opinion of that sect. See vi. 21. and the notes of Valesius. He was a prudent, cool, and moderate man, who made no scruple to commend what he thought commendable in Christians of all parties; and though he calls the society of the orthodox *the Church*, yet he did not believe that all they who separated themselves from it were therefore profligate people and reprobates. As he was a lawyer, says Le Clerc, he had learned and acquired from the course of his studies a moderation and an equity rarely to be found in the ecclesiastics of that time. Upon all occasions he declares himself openly against persecution[1], and appears a true friend to liberty civil and religious. Only in the affair of miracles he was too easy of belief, and hath disgraced himself and his History by relating some foolish stories of the marvellous kind.

Hermias Sozomenus was also a lawyer. His style is rather more elegant than that of Socrates; but in judgment he is not equal to him. Being of a family which had excessively admired the monks, and himself born and bred up in Palæstine, and educated at the feet of those *Gamaliels*, he contracted a superstitious and trifling turn of mind, and an amazing credulity for monkish miracles; and in this respect became *magnus nugarum helluo*. He speaks of the benefit which himself had received from the intercession of Michael the archangel. ii. 8.

[1] Julian, says he, did not attack the Christians with the cruelty of a Diocletian, and yet he may truly be said to have persecuted them; for I call it persecution to molest in any manner those who lead quiet and peaceable lives. διωγμὸν δὲ λέγω, τὸ ὁπωσοῦν ταράττειν τοὺς ἡσυχάζοντας. iii. 12.

He and Socrates were contemporaries, and lived in the time of Theodosius Junior. As historians, they so often and so largely coincide, that the one must have transcribed the other: and there is reason to think that Socrates wrote first, and that Sozomen was the copyist. See Valesius, Vit. Soz.

S. Basnage concludes that these two lawyers could not have had much practice and many briefs, since they found time to write ecclesiastical histories. 'Sozomeno in ea arte constituto multum otii ex causarum penuria contigisse eo liquet, quod ad Historiam scribendam se converterit.' Ann. iii. 395. His argument is both uncivil and inconclusive.

'Theodoret is, in my opinion, one of the most valuable of the Fathers. He is learned, he reasons well, especially in his Dialogues against the Greek heresies of his times: he is a good literal interpreter of the Scriptures. I cannot help admiring his prudence and his moderation, when I consider that he ended his Ecclesiastical History at the time when the Nestorian quarrels began, in which he was so deeply interested. But I fear his zeal against heretics imposed upon him almost as much as his admiration for the heroes of the ascetic life, with whom he was charmed. Monasteries have undoubtedly sent forth great men into the world; but these disciples of the monks contracted there in their youth a superstitious disposition, which is hardly ever thrown off; and the weak side of this able man seems to have been an excessive credulity.' Beausobre Hist. de Man. t. i. p. 226.

Theodoret's learning and abilities were great, but he wanted the calmness and moderation and impartiality which are requisite in an historian. He cannot speak of the Arians, and of the emperor Julian, without losing his temper; he hath given a good character to some worthless men, because he thought them orthodox; and in the point of miracles, he was either credulous beyond all measure, or he judged it expedient to keep up devotion and piety in the common people, by feeding them with legends suited to their taste.

Whatever was his reason for it, he wrote the Lives of the most eminent monks, in which we find a beggar who

died suddenly whilst he was acting the dead man to get alms from a saint, and then was raised to life again; an hermit fed by a lion, who used to bring him dates *in his pocket*; apples sent from heaven to the monks; a dead man declaring who had murdered him; Jews conducted by lions; the emperor's sick horse cured by a monk, who anointed his belly with holy oil, and made him drink some water sanctified with the sign of the cross; together with the marvellous exploits of Symeon Stylites, &c. A work how unworthy of Theodoret!

> 'Dans ce sac ridicule où Scapin s'envelope
> Je ne reconnois plus l'auteur du Misanthrope.'

Du Pin mentions this book and these miracles, in a way which shows that he gave little credence to them, and this might help to draw upon him a persecution from those who perhaps believed them no more than he.

Amongst the solitary saints celebrated by Theodoret, there was one who wore the same coat all his life, putting a patch where it was torn, from time to time. 'It would have been a proper subject for a metaphysicotheological debate in the fifth century, whether this continued to be the *same* coat under all these changes, and it would have furnished a fair opportunity for visions, revelations and miracles in confirmation of the *identity* or *diversity* of the *holy tunic*, and then for censures and excommunications.'

In his writings against heretics of all denominations, he makes no mention of the Origenists, or of the Pelagians, whence it is probable that he thought them innocent. He himself hath affirmed that *infants are without sin*; which smells strongly of Pelagianism.

He attacked Cyril of Alexandria, and he wrote in defence of Theodorus Mopsuestenus, an honest and a learned man, who had the misfortune to displease boobies; and this is the reason why he is not called *Saint Theodoret.* But he is called Μακάριος, *the blessed Theodoret*, which is almost as good; and the title of *Saint* became insignificant, or rather ridiculous, when it was given to such men as Cyril.

'Contra Cyrillum scribere, idem pene est quod adver-

sus Synodum Oecumenicam cui præfuit Cyrillus. Itaque Nicephorus—diserte affirmat Theodoritum contra tertiam Oecumenicam Synodum scripsisse. Atque idcirco, tametsi de ecclesiâ catholica optime meritus fuerit, nec natalis ejus dies annua commemoratione honoratus est, nec ipse inter sanctos Patres locum suum habet in Menologio.' Valesius Præfat.

Here we see one of the bad effects of a superstitious veneration for general councils. The reputation of Theodoret must be blasted, because he dared to oppose Cyril, Cyril who was lord president of the factious council of Ephesus, and who disturbed the whole Christian world with his *quarrels* and his *anathematisms*.

> 'Faucibus ingentem fumum (mirabile dictu)
> Evomit, involvitque domum caligine cæca,
> Prospectum eripiens oculis; glomeratque sub antro
> Fumiferam noctem, commixtis *igne tenebris*.'
>
> Virgil Æn. viii. 252.

Cyril's confession of faith (or his anathematisms) was injudicious, obscure, uncharitable, and, I think, not reconcileable with the holy Scriptures. 'Anathematismi ejus, si verum volumus, et obscuri sunt, et doctrinæ Nestorii peregrini. Eorum et nonnulli, primâ quidem specie, pietatem non redolent.' S. Basnage. Ann. iii. 337.

Theodoret was accused of being a Nestorian; a dreadful accusation in those days, when it was a far greater crime to have thought Nestorius innocent, than to have worshipped Judas Iscariot, or an Ægyptian monkey. But the Nestorian controversy was so perplexed on both sides, and involved in so many and so great difficulties, that the contenders should have agreed in pardoning and tolerating each other.

Theodoret was contemporary with Socrates and Sozomen, and seems to have written after them both; for his History often supplies the deficiencies in theirs.

'Porro de historia Theodoriti optime omnino judicavit Photius in Bibliotheca. Ejus stylum ait præstantiorem esse Socratis et Sozomeni stylo. Perspicuum enim esse et grandem, nec tamen redundantem, sed historiæ rerum

ecclesiasticarum aptissime convenientem: nisi quod translationibus interdum utitur audacius, et, ut ita dicam, putide.—Illud præterea in historia Theodoriti reprehendendum mihi videtur, quod in toto opere nullam notam temporum adhibuit.' Valesius.

Theodoret's character may be found in an Epistle which he wrote to a man of quality, and a consul, in which he thought it necessary for his justification to give some account of himself.

My parents, says he, before I was conceived, made a vow to God that they would consecrate me to his service, and they educated me according to their promise. After having passed my first days in a monastery, I was ordained bishop against my inclination. For twenty-five years I have so lived in that station, as never to be at variance, never to prosecute any one at law, or to be prosecuted. The same I can say of all the pious clergy who are under my inspection, none of whom was ever seen in any court of justice. Neither I nor my domestics ever received the smallest present from any person, not even a loaf or an egg. My patrimony I gave away long ago to the poor, and I have made no new acquisitions. I have neither house, nor land, nor money, nor a sepulchre where my friends may lay my body when I die. I am possessor of nothing, save the poor raiment which I wear. Out of the ecclesiastical revenues I have built porticos, and two very large bridges, and put the public baths in good condition. I found the city without water, and the inhabitants obliged to go to the river to fetch it. I built them an aqueduct, which supplies them plentifully. I found eight villages infected with the heresy of the Marcionites, and one full of Eunomians, and another of Arians. I have converted them all, yet not without incurring much danger, having been often assaulted, wounded, stoned, and reduced to death's door. Epist. 81. et Epist. 113. ad Leon.

Thus Theodoret was extremely poor[m], and therefore not qualified to contend with Cyril, who was rich, and drew

[m] Augustin was as poor as Theodoret, and so was Paulinus, bishop of Nola, who had parted with great possessions.

over the emperor to his side[n], by bribing an eunuch who governed his royal master.

During the Nestorian quarrel, when the emperor sent a letter to Theodoret, to let him know that, if he would not submit, he should be deposed and removed, he laughed at the threatening, knowing that he had nothing to lose except his garment, and that some friend would give him another, and not let him go naked; but the Christians in his diocese were all greatly alarmed with the fear of being deprived of him, and earnestly importuned him to come to some accommodation for their sakes. His diocese was large, and contained eight hundred parishes.

Theodoret, speaking of the violent and cruel persecution raised against Chrysostom and his friends, says, 'Porro quot episcopi ejus caussâ pulsi sint ecclesiis, et in extremos imperii Romani fines deportati, quot item Monachi eandem calamitatem perpessi sint, superfluum arbitror commemorare, et prolixam historiam texere: præsertim cum ea quæ tristia sunt, contrahenda esse censeam, et auctorum *qui ejusdem nobiscum sunt fidei* errata obtegenda.' v. 34.

But if Christians, giving a loose to pride, insolence, and revenge, treat their brethren and their betters with the utmost inhumanity, and do what an honest Pagan would blush to do, is a historian to spare them, and to draw a veil over their iniquities, *because they were orthodox?*

As I cannot commend Theodoret for this remark, so I think him very discreet for saying nothing in his History concerning Cyril, except these few words: 'Erat eo tempore episcopus Alexandriæ Cyrillus, Theophili fratris filius, qui patruo in episcopatu successerat.' v. 35. As he had been at variance with Cyril, he did well to pass him by without praise or censure, especially if we consider how many things he might justly have said against him.

A very ample account of Theodoret may be found in Tillemont, H. E. xv. 207. Du Pin, B. E. iv. Fleury, H. E. and Cousin, who translated Theodoret's History into French; and they are all friends and favourers of this prelate. Father Garnier published an additional volume to the Works of Theodoret, and Dissertations upon his Life and Writings,

[n] Theodosius Junior.

with a view to insult him, to run him down as a heretic, and to censure him upon all occasions. If Theodoret had been a *Damasus*, a *Cyril*, a *Thomas Becket*, a *Kalendar Saint*, Garnier would have paid him more respect.

The fifth general council, at Constantinople, A. D. *553*, thought fit to condemn the impious writings of Theodoret relating to Cyril and the Nestorian quarrels.

EVAGRIUS was a lawyer, and a pleader, as it seems, at Antioch. He wrote an History from A. D. 431. to A. D. 594.

'Cæterum laudanda est in primis Evagrii diligentia, qui cum Historiam Ecclesiasticam scribere agressus esset, quæcunque ad id argumentum spectabant, ex optimis scriptoribus collegit.—Stylus quoque ejus non improbandus est: habet enim elegantiam et venustatem, ut testatur etiam Photius. Sed quod præcipue in Evagrio laudandum est, ex Græcis ecclesiasticæ historiæ scriptoribus, solus hic rectæ fidei doctrinam integram atque illibatam servavit, ut post Photium observavit Baronius. Illud tamen in eo reprehensionem meretur, quod non tantam diligentiam adhibuit in conquirendis antiquitatis esclesiasticæ monumentis, quantam in legendis profanis scriptoribus. Stylus præterea plerisque in locis redundat ac luxuriat, ut recte judicavit Photius.' Valesius.

'A fabulosis narrationibus non nimis alienum esse Evagrium scribit Casaubonus.' Fabricius. B. Gr.

'Quæ de imaginibus, reliquiis, miraculis, Evagrius multa habet, ipsius Historiam in commendatione non ponunt.' S. Basnage, Ann. iii. 921.

This is saying too little; for in points of theological controversy, Evagrius was an injudicious prejudiced zealot, and in the article of miracles a most ridiculous and contemptible bigot, and a relater of tales, which whosoever can swallow and relish, is fit, if we may be permitted to use the homely phrase of some poet,

'Culum lingere Cerberi cacantis.'

But then, as Photius, Baronius, and Valesius observe, he was always on the right side of the question, which is more than can be said of any other Greek writer of eccle-

siastical history, and which atones even for a want of common sense, and sets him above Eusebius and Socrates; for 'Socrates,' says Tillemont, 'was a lawyer, and very ignorant of the spirit and discipline of the church. Hence it comes to pass that he commends equally either *Catholics* or *Heretics*, when they did things which seemed to him to be commendable.' H. E. x. p. 232, 233.

Theodorus Byzantius, 'Lector majoris ecclesiæ Constantinopolitanæ, duplex opus Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ conscripsit. Primum opus nihil aliud erat quam historia tripartita, duobus libris comprehensa, quam ex Socrate, Sozomeno, ac Theodorito unum in corpus collegerat.—Secundum opus duobus pariter libris comprehensum fuit, quibus res in ecclesia gestas ab iis temporibus in quibus desierat Socrates, usque ad principatum Justini senioris complexus est. Utinam vero Historiam Ecclesiasticam Theodori integram hodie haberemus. Multa enim scitu digna in ea continebantur: Consulatus quoque quibus quidque gestum fuerat, accurate erant adscripti, ut patet ex fragmentis.' Valesius.

Philostorgius lived in the fourth and fifth century. His History reached from A. D. 300 to A. D. 425. It is lost, in a great measure, and there only remains an Epitome, or extracts from it, made by Photius, and a few fragments.

Philostorgius was an Eunomian: he censures the Semiarians as well as the Consubstantialists, and defends the Arians and the Eunomians.

'Narrat autem Philostorgius fere contraria omnibus ecclesiasticis historicis, laudibus extollens quos novit Arianismo infectos, et conviciis orthodoxos perfundens: ita ut hoc ejus opus non tam historia esse videatur, quam hæreticorum laudatio, cum nuda et mera vituperatione atque accusatione Catholicorum. Stylus illi comptior; et poëticis sine tædio, minimeque ingratis vocibus utitur. Tropi quoque ac verba significantia gratiam ipsi cum jucunditate conciliant. Nisi quod interdum audacius ipsis, vel nimium detortis utendo, in frigidum et importunum sermonem incidit. Ornatur ab illo varie oratio, vel ad satietatem; ita ut in obscuritatem, nec eam semper gratam, occulte trahatur auditor. Sæpe etiam sententias apte suis locis inserit. Ipse vero scriptor mendax est, et a fabulis minime

abstinens. Miraculorum vero et vitæ gratia laudat Eusebium Nicomediæ episcopum, quem etiam magnum nominat, et Theophilum Indum, aliosque complures.' &c. Photius.

In these extracts of Philostorgius, Photius often begins a section with, Ὁ δυσσεβὴς, ὁ φιλοψευδὴς, The *impious wretch*, the *Liar*, the *enemy of God*, the *dotard*, &c. says so and so. But this was the way of Greek writers in all times, as Cicero observes. 'Sit ista in Græcorum levitate perversitas, qui maledictis insectantur eos a quibus de veritate dissentiunt.' De Fin. 11.

With all his defects, his credulity, and partiality to his sect (of which he had a large share) it is to be wished that we had Philostorgius entire; for he wrote the history of his own times, and of some persons whom he knew and with whom he had conversed. It would not be amiss to have one Arian historian to compare with the Consubstantialists. He had picked up several miracles wrought by Arian bishops. The Homoousians rejected them with disdain, and yet boasted of miracles equally improbable.

Theodosius the First was a warm Consubstantialist, and was perpetually making absurd and severe laws against heretics; yet Philostorgius observes that he was a prosperous prince, and blessed with success in all his undertakings, and supposes that Providence thus recompensed him for his zeal against Paganism. p. 539. He also speaks very handsomely of Apollinaris, Basil, and Gregory Nazianzen, and observes that of all the Consubstantialists they were the most eminent for learning, eloquence, and elegance of style, and that Athanasius, compared to them, was a mere child, and a superficial writer.

Apollinaris, though ranked amongst heretics for reasons mentioned above, yet joined with the Consubstantialists against Arianism.

The laws of Constantine, most of which may be found in the Theodosian Code, are remarkable on one account or other.

Several of them are humane and charitable, and such as the spirit of Christianity would naturally suggest.

He and his successors made decrees which must have continually released multitudes from slavery.

He abolished the cruel punishment of crucifixion, and of breaking the legs, and of marking the face with a hot iron.

'Si quis in ludum fuerit, vel in metallum, pro criminum deprehensorum qualitate, damnatus, minime in ejus facie scribatur: dum et in manibus et in suris possit pœna damnationis una scriptione comprehendi: Quo facies, quæ ad similitudinem pulchritudinis cœlestis est figurata, minime maculetur.' Cod. Th. l. ix. tit. 40. p. 293. et Gothofred.

The Pagans used to stigmatize themselves (but not in the face) out of religion. See Van Dale, Dissert. p. 64. and Grotius, ad Apocal. xiii. p. 1205. and the commentators on Levit. xix. 28. Soldiers were also stigmatized.

He made a law against gladiatorial shows, which however continued till Honorius put an end to that wicked diversion, A. D. 403.

'Cruenta spectacula in otio civili et domestica quiete non placent: Quapropter, qui omnino gladiatores esse prohibemus, eos qui forte delictorum causa hanc conditionem atque sententiam mereri consueverant, metallo magis facies inservire, ut sine sanguine scelerum suorum pœnas agnoscant.' Cod. Th. l. xv. tit. 12. p. 395.

It would amaze one to consider how many lives had been thrown away in these combats. 'Credo,' says Lipsius, 'imo scio nullum bellum tantam cladem vastitatemque generi humano intulisse, quam hos ad voluptatem ludos. Mentior si non unus aliquis mensis Europæ stetit vicenis capitum millibus, aut trecenis.' Saturn. i. 12.

He forbad the tax-gatherers to seize upon men's labouring servants, or oxen, for the payment of debts to the government. Even common prudence required this moderation; because such violent methods would have reduced farmers to a state of beggary, and so have made them for ever unable to pay their taxes; 'ex quo tributorum inlatio retardatur.' Cod. Th. l. ii. tit. xxx. p. 224.

Zosimus says that he oppressed the poor, and used them cruelly to make them pay their taxes. l. ii. but Zosimus was a bigoted Pagan.

He restrained exorbitant usury or interest, allowing at the same time that which was fair and reasonable. The

clergy were forbidden by ecclesiastical canons to receive any interest at all, and the senators, by the civil laws, were restrained from receiving as much as was permitted to other persons.

The Fathers, who condemned all usury in general, did not consider that their scheme was practicable only in the *Republic of Ideas*, and that the Roman empire could no more subsist without money lent and borrowed upon interest, than without air and water. Cod. Th. l. ii. tit. xxxiii. p. 230. See Barbeyac, Morale des Peres, p. 144. and an ingenious Treatise de Fœnore et Usuris, by G. Noodt.

He ordered that prisoners should be well used, and conveniently lodged, and made laws in favour of slaves and of debtors.

He appointed that poor parents should be relieved out of the treasury, to prevent the exposing and murdering of children.

He made a very severe law against rapes, in which he decreed, that nurses who assisted in seducing or stealing away virgins, should have melted lead poured down their throats; a barbarous and brutish punishment. He is supposed to have ordered all who were guilty in this affair to be burnt and cast to the beasts.

His son Constans mitigated some of the severity of his father's edict; but appointed that slaves who were found guilty should be burnt. Cod. Th. l. ix. tit. xxiv. p. 189, &c. and Valesius on Sozom. i. 9.

He restrained the frequency of divorces upon slight occasions, but admitted them for other causes besides adultery; and yet more liberty was taken by the Romans in the affair of divorce than the laws of Constantine allowed. Cod. Th. l. iii. tit. xiii. p. 310. et Gothofred.

He exempted the clergy from the burden of civil offices[n], which was often very heavy. This law, if I were not an

[n] Julian abolished these exemptions, and obliged the clergy to serve civil offices. His law is, 'Decuriones, qui ut Christiani declinant munia, revocentur.' See Cod. Theod. l. xiii. tit. i. p. 7. and l. xii. tit. i. De Decurionibus, p. 336, &c. and Gothofred. Κληρικοὺς μέντοι πᾶσαν ἀτέλειαν καὶ τιμὴν καὶ τὰ σιτηρέσια ἀφείλετο· καὶ τοὺς ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν πειμένους νόμους ἀνεῖλε, καὶ τοῖς βουλευτηρίοις ἀπέδωκε. 'Et clericis

interested person, I should venture to commend as reasonable. To this he added another, that there should be no more ecclesiastics ordained than were necessary; a proper caution at that time, and in all times; for many reasons which it is needless to mention.

By a law addressed to the Roman people, he granted his subjects a permission to bequeath as much as they would to the church. Every one knows how these donations were multiplied, and how bestowed in process of time, to the emolument of the church, and, as the Canon Law assures us, of the state likewise: 'Augmentatur namque respublica in sustentando viros ecclesiasticos, quorum precibus regna juvantur.'

However that be, 'Hinc deinceps opes ecclesiarum, et inter alias Romanæ,' says Gothofred, Chron. Cod. Th. p. xxi.

They who disinherit their children, grand-children, and near relations, for no fault, and leave their substance to pious uses and public charities, deserve to be treated as idiots and lunatics, and to have their will set aside as a *Testamentum inofficiosum.*

He is supposed to have given a civil jurisdiction to bishops, and to have made them receivers of appeals, and final judges in causes wherein religion was no ways concerned. See Tillemont, Hist. des Emp. iv. p. 295. and in the Notes, who thinks that this was a grievous burden upon men who were desirous of being better employed, and had things of higher importance to perform. See also Valesius on Euseb. Vit. Const. iv. 27. and Sozom. i. 9.

'Synesius, who was a bishop, says, Πολιτικὴν ἀρετὴν ἱερωσύνῃ συνάπτειν, τὸ κλώθειν ἐστὶ τὰ ἀσύγκλωστα. Epist. 67. i. e. 'What hath an ecclesiastic to do with politics?'

'A law of Constantine ordains that the single testimony of a bishop shall suffice, without hearing other witnesses. This prince took a short cut: he judged of *causes* by *per-*

quidem immunitatem omnem atque honorem, et annonas ademit: legesque in eorum gratiam latas abrogavit: ipsos denique curiis restituit.' Sozom. v. 5. Τοὺς ἐν κλήρῳ κατειλεγμένους εἰς τὴν τῶν βουλευτῶν ἀνέστρεφε λειτουργίαν. 'Eos qui clero adscripti erant, ad publicas decurionum functiones retraxit.' Philostorgius, p. 514.

sons, and of *persons* by *dignities*.' L'Esprit des Loix, ii. xxix. 16.

The old Roman laws showed no favour to natural children. Constantine, to discourage concubinage, and to encourage matrimony in persons who lived together in that way, ordered, that if a man married his concubine, the children which he had by her before marriage should become legitimate; but for natural children he made no provision, and gave them no relief. Valentinian I. afterwards permitted a father to leave a small part of his fortunes to his natural children, and Theodosius Junior confirmed it. See Gothofred, ad Cod. Th. l. iv. tit. vi. p. 351, &c.

The first council of Toledo, A. D. 400. hath this canon: 'He who with a believing wife hath a concubine, is excommunicated: but if his concubine be in the stead of a wife, and he adhere to her alone, whether she be called wife or concubine, he is not to be rejected from communion.' 'This canon shows that there were concubines approved by the church. According to the Roman laws, every woman could not be the legitimate wife of every man: both were to be Roman citizens, and of suitable condition. A senator could not marry a freed woman: a free man could not marry a slave: and the cohabitation of slaves was not called by the name of marriage. But a woman who could not be taken for a wife, might be taken as a concubine, and the laws allowed it, provided the man had only one concubine, and was not a married man. The children of such parents were neither legitimate, nor bastards, but natural children, acknowledged by the father, and capable of receiving legacies. The church meddled not with these distinctions of the civil laws, but, regarding only the law of nature, approved every conjunction of one man with a woman, if it was with one woman, and perpetual; and the more so, because the Holy Scriptures employ the name of wife or of concubine, indifferently.' Fleury, H. E. t. v. 120.

Libanius being distressed by a law made against bastards (for he confesses that he had one) says that Theodosius granted him a dispensation, or even repealed the law to favour him. Liban. Vit. p. 61, 62.

'Si quis,' says Constantine, 'in orbe Romano eunuchos fecerit, capite puniatur.' Cod. l. iv. tit. xlii. 1. See also Novel. cxlii. and Leonis Constit. lx. Pagan emperors had made laws against this execrable crime. Digest. l. xlviii. tit. viii. 3, 4. 6.

He provided for the children of the poor out of his own revenues; and afterwards many charitable laws were made by him, and by Christian emperors who succeeded him, for the relief of the sick and helpless, beyond what had been done by Pagans; though something of that kind must have been always performed in civilized countries.

Concerning the places called *Valetudinaria*, Νοσοκομεῖα, see Seneca Epist. xxvii. de Ira, i. 16. Nat. Quæst. 1. Præfat. and the Notes of Lipsius, Gruter, and Gronovius. The temples of Æsculapius seem to have been a kind of hospitals; and doubtless the priests, who were commonly physicians, used their best endeavours to cure the patients, and the honour of curing them was ascribed to the God.

Pliny mentions the gall of a white cock, as a cure for disorders in the eyes; and an *old inscription* in Gruter informs us that one Valerius Aper, a blind soldier, consulted Æsculapius; that the god ordered him to make a salve of honey and the blood of a white cock, and anoint his eyes for three days; that he applied it, and recovered his sight, and came to the temple and returned public thanks to the god; and that this happened in the time of Antoninus Pius. See Harduin on Pliny, N. H. xxix. 38.

He ordered that no woman of reputation should be arrested and forced out of her house for debt. Cod. Th. l. i. tit. x. p. 57.

He made a law against delators, after his victory over Maxentius, with a view to settle peace and tranquillity at Rome. He ordered such offenders to have their tongues cut out. 'Illud sane et ex hac lege et aliis nonnullis discimus, Constantinum pœnas acerbissimas legibus indixisse, si quisquam principum, ut—vitia frangeret.' Gothofred, ad Cod. Th. l. x. tit. x. p. 431.

He published an edict by which he declared himself ever ready to receive and hear any complaints against his officers, governors, and counsellors of state, which should be well-grounded, and promised not only to do justice to the suf-

ferers, but to recompense them for their pains. Cod. Th. Chron. p. 25.

He made a law to punish adultery with death, which had not been a capital crime, in that sense, before in the Roman empire. See the First Volume of these Remarks, p. 302. and Gothofred, ad Cod. Th. l. xi. tit. xxxvi. p. 295.

He repealed the Papian law. One of the corruptions which soon crept into the church, was a fanatical notion concerning celibacy, the recommending it too much, and the requiring it of several: for which the civil magistrate ought to have reprimanded and checked the ecclesiastics. The Fathers began from early times to talk weakly and injudiciously upon this subject, and to cry up a single life beyond measure. Augustus, to people the empire, exhausted by civil wars, and to restrain several abuses, made a law, 'de maritandis ordinibus,' which was called 'Lex Julia,' and another called 'Lex Papia Poppæa,' in which he encouraged and enforced matrimony by rewards to those who should comply, and by heavy penalties on the disobedient. It may be right, where the exigencies of the state cannot be pleaded to the contrary, to leave persons more liberty in this than was granted to them by the laws of Augustus; but the good of civil society certainly requires that marriage be permitted to all, that it be accounted honourable, that it be attended with some privileges, and that the parents of a numerous family be considered, employed, and recompensed, *cæteris paribus*, beyond others, and in many cases have the preference. So thought and so acted the wise Romans, when they were in their most flourishing condition: but in the time of Constantine notions were entertained, which afterwards helped to fill the world with drones, mendicants, fanatics, and imaginary dæmoniacs, not to mention other bad consequences. Ambrose affirms that Alexandria, Afric, and the East, where there was the greatest number of religious virgins, were therefore more populous than other countries. De Virg. iii. See Sozom. i. 9.

He restrained and discouraged, but did not absolutely forbid and suppress the Pagan practice of sacrificing, and consulting the entrails of victims by the *Haruspices*.

The priests of the river-god Nile were *Androgyni*. Constantine commanded this scandalous order of priesthood to be suppressed. Euseb. Vit. Const. iv. 25.

What could be the reason for which the Ægyptians honoured their favourite god in this ridiculous and obscene manner? I shall here offer a conjecture about it: 'Quum multi dii Paganorum utriusque sexus sive ἀρρενοθήλεις putarentur, Nilum inter eos fuisse numeratum minime mirum est. Ille Ægyptum rigat et serit, tanquam mas: ejus autem limus sole calefactus et fruges et animalia parit; hoc fœmineum. Colebatur itaque vel ab androgynis, vel forsan ab impuris nebulonibus qui muliebria patiebantur.'

The temple of Venus in Phœnice was a school of such sort of debauchery, and therefore destroyed by Constantine. 'Lucus hic erat ac delubrum, quod non in media urbe, nec in foro aut plateis positum erat cujusmodi multa visuntur in civitatibus, ornamenti causa ambitiose constructa, sed devium procul a triviis et publico calle, fœdissimo dæmoni quem Venerem appellant, in parte verticis Libani montis consecratum. Erat illic schola quædam nequitiæ, omnibus obscœnis hominibus, et qui corpus suum omni licentia corruperant, aperta. Quippe effeminati quidam, et feminæ potius dicendi quam viri, sexus sui gravitate abdicata[a] *muliebria patientes*, *dæmonem placabant*. Ad hæc illegitimi concubitus et adulteria, fœdaque et nefaria flagitia eo in templo, tanquam in loco ab omni lege ac rectore vacuo, peragebantur.' Euseb. Laud. Const. viii. p. 736.

When Eusebius says, θηλείᾳ νόσῳ τὴν δαίμονα ἱλεοῦντο, he borrows his expression from Herodotus, ἐνέσκηψε ὁ Θεὸς θήλειαν νοῦσον· 'immisit ipsis Venus morbum femineum, I. 105. p. 44. But θήλεια νοῦσος in Herodotus means τὰ καταμήνια, and they who think that it means something else, or something worse, are mistaken. See the commentators on Longinus, who greatly admires this modest and polite periphrasis of the historian; and an Epistle of Musgrave 'de hæmorrhagiis menstruis virorum,' in the Philos. Transact. MDCCI. p. 864.

[a] θηλείᾳ νόσῳ τὴν δαίμονα ἱλεοῦντο.

Bacchus was ἀρρενόθηλυς. Διονύσῳ τῷ γύνιδι—ἀφιέρωσαν ἐκκλησίαν, τὸ καταγέλαστον καὶ ἀνδρόγυνον ἐν αὐτῇ ἱδρύσαντες ἄγαλμα. 'Ecclesiam Baccho Gynidi consecrarunt, simulacro ejus ridiculo et androgyno in ea collocato.' Theodoret iii. 7. Jupiter ἀνδρόγυνος γίνεται, εἰ καὶ μὴ τὴν γαστέρα, ἀλλὰ γοῦν τὸν μηρὸν κυοφορῶν, ἵνα καὶ ταῦτα παρὰ φύσιν αὐτῷ πράττοιτο. οὗ καὶ τὸ ἐθύραμβον κύημα ἀνδρόγυνον γενόμενον ἑκατέραν ἐνύβρισε φύσιν· 'androgynus factus est, non in utero quidem sed in femore fœtum gestans, ut et ista præter naturam ab eo committerentur. Unde ortus Bacchus ipse quoque androgynus, utrumque sexum contumelia affecit.' Evagrius i. 11.

It appears from one of his laws, that the Pagans attempted sometimes to compel the Christians to join with them in acts of religion. He ordered such offenders to be bastinadoed, or if they were rich, to be fined; which was not amiss.

By a law which condemns magic arts exercised to the hurt of others, he permits charms, and incantations, and such sort of tricks, intended for harmless or good purposes.

He made laws for the religious observation of Sunday. Euseb. Vit. Const. iv. 18. Sozom. i. 8.

'Sicut indignissimum videbatur, diem solis, veneratione sui celebrem, altercantibus jurgiis et noxiis partium contentionibus occupari, ita gratum ac jocundum est, eo die quæ sunt maxime votiva compleri: atque ideo emancipandi et manumittendi die festo cuncti licentiam habeant, et super his rebus actus non prohibeantur.' Cod. Th. l. 11. tit. viii. p. 118.

Before this law, he had given one which runs thus:

'Omnes judices urbanæque plebes, et cunctarum artium officia venerabili die solis quiescant. Ruri tamen positi agrorum culturæ libere licenterque inserviant; quoniam frequenter evenit, ut non aptius alio die frumenta sulcis, aut vineæ scrobibus mandentur, ne occasione momenti pereat commoditas cœlesti provisione concessa. Cod. l. iii. tit. xiii. 3.

Compare this law with Virgil, Georg. i. 268, whom the legislator seems to have had in view;

'Quippe etiam festis quædam exercere diebus
Fas et jura sinunt. Rivos deducere nulla
Religio vetuit, segeti prætendere sepem,
Insidias avibus moliri, incendere vepres,
Balantumque gregem fluvio mersare salubri.'

'Scævola, consultus quid feriis agi liceret, respondit, Quod omissum noceret.' Macrobius Saturn. i. 16.

The emperor Leo repealed this law of Constantine, and published one more strict. Constit. liv.

Gothofred, in his notes on the Theod. Code, gives us the laws for the observation of Sunday, made from A. D. 321. to A. D. 425, by Constantine, Valentinian I. and II. and Theodosius I. and II.

He obliged his soldiers to repeat on Sundays a prayer addressed to the one only God. The Christians would have died a thousand deaths, rather than have addressed a prayer to Jupiter; and therefore this may be looked upon as a sort of violence offered to the consciences of the Pagans: but it must be considered that the Pagans in general, the Roman soldiers in particular, were hardly troubled with pious scruples of this kind. They who used to worship their own worthless emperors living or dead, and their own standards, were not men who would have accounted this any oppression or infringement of religious liberty. If any of them had hesitated, his comrades probably would have laughed him to scorn, and have said to him, as one slave in Terence says to another who seemed to boggle at perjury:

'Nova nunc religio te istæc incessit.'

The Christians at that time being just delivered from persecution, must have had some sense of the odious nature of such cruel proceedings. Prudence also directed them not to terrify and provoke the Pagans too much; and therefore Constantine declared that he would compel no man to receive the Christian religion.

The first imperial law in favour of Christianity, which was published by Constantine and Licinius, began with this reasonable preamble:

Ηδη μὲν πάλαι σκοποῦντες τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς θρησκείας οὐκ ἀρνητέαν εἶναι, ἀλλ' ἑνὸς ἑκάστου τῇ διανοίᾳ καὶ βου-

λήσει ἐξουσίαν δοτέον τοῦ τὰ θεῖα πράγματα τημελεῖν κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ προαίρεσιν. — 'Jamdudum quidem, cum animadverteremus non esse cohibendam religionis libertatem, sed uniuscujusque arbitrio ac voluntati permittendum ut ex animi sui sententia rebus divinis operam daret.' Eusebius, x. 5.

But the Christians soon learned to sing a new song, and to acquire a taste for *wholesome severities*. First they deprived heretics of their places of worship, then they forbad them to assemble any where, and then they fined, imprisoned, banished, starved, whipped, and hanged them, for the advancement of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and for the honour of Christianity. Such were the dictates of *public wisdom*. In the mean time the bishops, in their councils, made canons forbidding any Catholic to marry his children to Heretics, or to leave them any legacy, though they were the nearest relations.

The *Laws against Heretics* collected in the *Theodosian Code*, stand as a shameful monument of the persecuting Anti-christian spirit which brake out in the fourth century, and grew more and more violent in the following times.

It is the duty of historians to give an impartial and just account of such cruel proceedings, that people may be taught to love their liberties, civil and religious, and to beware of those who would strip them of these blessings, and also, 'ut qui insontes damnaverunt, ipsi causam dicant omnibus sæculis.'

He ordered churches to be built where they were necessary, and even where they were not, as in places which were inhabited only by Jews, says Epiphanius, Hær. xxx. 11.

He condemned those who should βλασφημῆσαι Χριστὸν, 'speak evil of Christ,' to lose half their estate, if we may credit Nicephorus, vii. 34. This was an imprudent and unreasonable law, giving too much encouragement to indiscreet over-zealous Christians, or busy informers, to accuse Jews or Pagans, or perhaps Heretics, of words spoken in the heat of dispute, or in common conversation. For the honour of Constantine we will suppose either that this law was never made, or that it was made *in terrorem*, and never executed. Such decrees are beneath a *prince*, and only fit for an *inquisitor-general*.

Afterwards, under Constantius, the severity of the laws against Paganism was increased, and sacrificing, together with idolatrous worship, was made a capital crime, which without question filled the church with new Christians, such as they were; for there is not, I think, one Pagan upon record, who died a martyr for his religion in those days. Under Honorius, A. D. 408, we find a Pagan confessor, one Generidus, an officer in the Roman army, who threw up his commission, because he would not conform to Christianity; but the emperor could not well spare him, and so would not part with him. Zosimus, l. v.

He made a law against Heretics, by which he forbad them to have any conventicles, and to meet together in public or in private, to perform acts of religion. Eusebius Vit. Const. iii. 64, 65. Sozom. ii. 32. This was mere insolent tyranny; and Eusebius deserves to be censured for having spoken favourably of it: and yet he is forced to own that it made many hypocritical conformists and nominal Catholics. A fine acquisition! But Constantine, by commanding armies in his youth, and by his success and victories, and by being master of the empire, got a royal and military habit and disposition of giving orders in a very absolute way, and had no just notion of religious toleration.

He also commanded that heretical books should be sought for and burnt.

He made a severe law against those who should embrace Judaism. This likewise was unreasonable.

But we are not to conclude that all the laws of Christian emperors against Paganism, Heresy, and Schism, were strictly executed. The contrary often appears: the Roman senate was much attached to idolatry, and Sozomen observes of Constantine, that he did not use to inflict all that he had threatened in his edicts, ii. 32. and several Pagan writers, under Christian emperors, declare themselves openly, and speak boldly enough in behalf of their old religion.

There is a law of Constantine, which shows that himself was not altogether free from Pagan superstition, in which he orders the *Haruspices* to be consulted, if any public edifice was struck with lightning. See Le Clerc, Bibl. A. et M. xxviii. 157, &c. Dacier on Horace, Carm. I. ii. 3.

Cod. Th. l. xvi. tit. x. p. 257. and S. Basnage Ann. ii. 673. who endeavours to excuse the emperor. We may add to this, that a temple of the goddess Concord, being decayed by length of time, was repaired or rebuilt by Constantine, if we may trust to an inscription in *Lilius Giraldus*. Zosimus pretends that he built some temples at Constantinople.

Constantine was severe in his punishments; which shows that by temper he was disposed to cruelty. If any civil officer drew a matron out of her house by violence, he decreed that he should be punished not only *capitali pœna* but *exquisitis suppliciis*, i. e. says Gothofred, that he should be burnt alive. Cod. Th. l. i. tit. x. p. 57, 58. He appointed this punishment for various offences. See Cod. Th. l. x. tit. iv. p. 406. 'Vivicomburii porro pœnam et aliis pluribus constitutionibus, et facinoribus facile imposuit Constantinus; quomodo et alias idem in exacerbandis pœnis aliquando nimius fuit.' Gothofred.

To burn men alive became thence forward a very common punishment, to the disgrace of Christianity. At last it was thought too cruel for traitors, murderers, poisoners, parricides, &c. and only fit for *heretics*.

One cannot help charging Constantine both with absurdity and with hypocrisy on this occasion. He thought it a barbarous thing to brand a malefactor in the cheek or the forehead, and he made no scruple to burn him at a stake!

The military laws enacted by him and his successors are pretty severe, and burning alive was one of the punishments for greater offences.

Perhaps it is impossible to keep up military discipline without rigour; but certain it is that the case of soldiers and sailors hath been frequently most deplorable, in their being so often subject to the arbitrary insolence of men who had not so much humanity as a wolf or a tiger; for a brute, when his hunger is satisfied, is not mischievous, but men who are cruel, are so, full and fasting.

THE CHRISTIANS, being blessed with an emperor of their own religion, were of opinion that the Divine Providence had in a signal manner appeared in raising up and protecting Constantine, and in destroying the enemies of

the church. There is usually much rashness and presumption in pronouncing that the calamities of sinners are particular judgments of God; yet if from sacred and profane, from antient and modern historians, a collection were made of all the cruel persecuting tyrants, who delighted in tormenting their fellow-creatures, and who died not the common death of all men, nor were visited after the visitation of all men, but whose plagues were horrible and strange, even a sceptic would be moved at the evidence, and would be apt to suspect that it was Θεῖόν τι, that the hand of God was in it. But the case of the persecuting emperors and princes is still more particular, if we consider, first the matter of fact, and secondly the prophecies concerning it.

Herod the Great was the first persecutor of Christianity, as he attempted to destroy Christ in his infancy, and for that wicked end slew the male children at Bethlehem. The miseries which befel this inhuman tyrant and his family are recorded by Josephus, and his calamitous death, and long and grievous sufferings before it, by a burning fever, a voracious appetite, a difficulty of breathing, swellings in his limbs, loathsome ulcers within and without, breeding lice and worms; violent torments and convulsions; so that he endeavoured to kill himself, but was restrained by his friends. The Jews thought these evils to be divine judgements upon him for his wickedness.

He left a numerous family of children and grand-children, though he had put some to death, which in the space of about a hundred years was extinct.

Herod Antipas, who beheaded John the Baptist, and treated Christ contemptuously when he was brought before him, was defeated by Aretas, an Arabian king, and afterwards had his dominions taken from him, and was sent into banishment, along with his infamous wife Herodias, by the emperor Caius.

'Of [*Salome*] the daughter of Herodias, it is related, that she going over the ice in the winter, the ice brake, and she slipped in up to the head, which at last was severed from her body by the sharpness of the ice; *idque non sine Dei numine*, God requiring her head for that of the Baptist's she desired; which, *if true*, was a wonderful Providence.' Whitby on Matt. xiv.

Whitby did well to say, *if true*; for the story hath the air of a legend, was unknown to the antients, can boast no better vouchers than Nicephorus and Metaphrastes[p], and is not adopted even by Tillemont. H. E. i. 101.

Of all the actors in this tragedy, Salome may seem to have been the least guilty, as she was a girl of fourteen years, and acted under the command of her profligate mother.

Pontius Pilate, who condemned Christ to death, was not long afterwards deposed and banished, and died by his own hands. 'Nor ought it to be passed over in silence, that Pilate himself, who condemned our Saviour to death, fell into so great calamities, in the reign of Caius, that he became his own executioner; the divine vengeance overtaking him[q] not long after his crime. This we learn from the Greek historians.' Eusebius, ii. 7. and Orosius, vii. 5.

The high priest *Caiaphas* was deposed by Vitellius three years after the death of Christ, which gave no offence to the Jews, who loved him not. Thus this wicked man, who condemned Christ for fear of disobliging the Romans, was ignominiously turned out of his office by the Roman governor. Josephus, Ant. xviii. 4.

To these we may add *Flaccus*, the governor of Ægypt, who persecuted, though not the Christians, yet the Jews in a most cruel manner, A. D. 38. 'The wrath of God overtook Flaccus. Bassus, a centurion, giving the signal to his soldiers, came upon him and forced him away from his own table. His effects were seized, and he would have been sent to Gyarus, the most barren of all the islands in the Ægean sea, if Lepidus had not entreated for him that he might be banished to Andros. They say that one night, lifting up his eyes to heaven, he cried out, O King of gods and men, thou art then a favourer of the Jews, and they do not falsely boast of being under thy protection!

[p] As to this compiler, we cannot help observing that he was not used according to his deserts by his contemporaries. The man's name was *Symeon*, and they surnamed him *Metaphrastes*; but they ought to have called him *Symeon Pseustes*, or *Symeon the Liar*.

[q] οὐκ εἰς μακρὸν, 'non longo post tempore;' which is wanting in the version of Valesius.

When Caius had ordered all the exiles of rank and reputation to be destroyed, and had particularly named Flaccus, assassins were sent to dispatch him. When they landed at Andros, Flaccus guessed for what purpose they were come, and getting into an unfrequented path, he fled to conceal himself: but they overtook him, and immediately some of them digged a pit in the ground, others dragged him into it, as he was struggling and screaming, and stabbed him the more cruelly for his making resistance.' Philo. See S. Basnage Ann. i. 493.

Catullus, governor of Libya, was also a cruel persecutor of the Jews, and died miserably, about A. D. 73.

'Such was the lenity of the emperors towards Catullus, that their disapprobation was all the punishment which he then underwent; but not long afterwards he fell into a complicated and incurable disease, and died wretchedly; sorely tormented in his body, and worse in his mind. He was dreadfully terrified, and continually crying out that he was haunted by the ghosts of those whom he had slain: and not being able to contain himself, he leaped out of the bed, as if he were tortured with fire, and put to the rack. His distemper increased, till his entrails were all corrupted, and came out of his body; and thus he perished, as signal an example as ever was known of the divine justice rendering to the wicked according to their deeds.' Josephus B. Jud. vii. 11.

The wicked and mad emperor *Caius* did not persecute the Christians, whom he knew not, but was determined to destroy the Jews, with whom they were mixed, and blasphemed the God of the Jews and Christians, and wanted to set up his own image in the temple at Jerusalem, to be worshipped by all the nation. He was cut off by a conspiracy, and Petronius, governor of Syria, saved his life by it; for Caius would have put him to death, because he had delayed to execute those frantic orders. See Tillemont, H. des Emp. i. p. 446, &c.

Herod Agrippa killed James the brother of John, and put Peter in prison; and the angel of the Lord smote him, and he was eaten with worms, and gave up the ghost. Acts xii. where Whitby says:

'Examples of the like exits of the persecutors of the

Christian faith, we have many in church history. Thus Tertullian saith of one Claudius Heminianus, one of their persecutors, that, *cum vivus vermibus ebullisset*, when worms broke forth from him whilst he was alive, he said, *Let no man know it, lest the Christians should rejoice.* And Eusebius saith of Maximian, *that sudden ulcers arose in his fundament and secret parts, from which sprung an incredible multitude of worms.* And of the uncle of Julian the Apostate, who persecuted the Christians, and trampled upon the sacred vessels, Theodoret and Chrysostom inform us, that he perished by this disease, *for his* scrotum *corrupted and bred worms.*

'An instance like to this we have in Pherecydes Syrus, *eaten up of lice*, for boasting of his great wisdom and his pleasant life, though he sacrificed to no god at all, saith Ælian, Var. Hist. iv. 28. Diog. Laert. i. p. 75. 77. See Bochart Hieroz. p. 2. l. iv. 23. p. 620, 621. So also was it under the Jewish state: for of Antiochus Epiphanes we read, *that worms sprang out of the body of this wicked man.* 2 Macc. ix. 8, 9. &c.'

Add to these the story of *Pheretimé*, from Herodotus:

'Nor did this wicked woman come to an happy end; for as soon as she had returned from Libya to Egypt, after having taken revenge on the Barcæans, she perished miserably, being eaten up of worms. Thus immoderate revenge brings down the displeasure of the gods upon cruel persons.' Herodotus iv. 205.

Ananias, the high priest, persecuted St. Paul, and insolently ordered the by-standers to smite him on the mouth. And Paul said, 'God shall smite thee,' &c.

Chrysostom and Augustin are of opinion that St. Paul (though perhaps he had no such design) spake this prophetically; 'for Ananias, after having contributed to the ruin of his country by a powerful faction which he had raised, and which produced many calamities, was slain, after the revolt of the Jews, A. D. 66. with his brother, and fell, not by the hands of the Romans, but by another faction of the Jews, which was headed by his own son.' Tillemont, H. E. i. p. 274.

Ananus the high priest slew St. James the lesser, A. D. 62. for which, and for other outrages, he was deposed

soon after by king Agrippa the younger, and probably perished in the destruction of Jerusalem. See Tillemont, H. E. i. p. 377, &c.

Nero turned his rage upon the Christians, A. D. 64. Four years after, in his great distress he attempted to kill himself; but being as mean-spirited and dastardly as he was wicked and cruel, he had not the resolution to do that piece of justice to the world, and was forced to beg help.

Soon after came on the destruction of Jerusalem, and the punishment of that nation and of their rulers for rejecting the Messias.

Domitian persecuted the Christians, A. D. 95. and was killed the next year.

Trajan, *Titus Antoninus*, and *Marcus Aurelius*, did indeed suffer the Christians to be ill-used, not through cruelty and tyranny, but by mistake and misrepresentations: These emperors had many great and good qualities, and nothing disastrous befel them.

Eusebius hath justly and judiciously represented the state of the Christians in those days: 'Trajan gave a rescript, in which it was decreed that Christians should not be sought out, but that if they were convicted they should be punished: by which, though the violence of the storm seemed to be in some measure abated, yet ill-disposed persons still found opportunities to exert their malice, whilst sometimes the populace, and sometimes the governors, were contriving ways to oppress us. Thus the persecution, though it was not general, was still kept up in different places, and many of the faithful were exposed to various trials and afflictions, and obtained the honour of martyrdom.' iii. 33.

Severus, who was violent and cruel, oppressed the Christians, A. D. 202. His latter end was calamitous, he was weary of his life, he left behind him a profligate eldest son, whose temper he knew, and whom he ought to have put to death, but had not the heart to do it, for the wicked wretch attempted to kill his father, and afterwards slew his brother. All the family of Severus perished miserably.

Saturninus, proconsul of Afric, in the reign of Severus, persecuted the Christians, and put several of them to death.

He lost his eye-sight some time after, as Tertullian says, Ad Scapulam.

Heliogabalus brought a new deity to Rome, and intended to compel all his subjects to adore this god, and no other, or, at least, to give him the preference to all other deities, and to make them no better than his *gentlemen ushers*, and *valets de chambre*; which must inevitably have brought on a persecution of the Christians; but this vile monster was slain soon after by his soldiers, A. D. 222. 'Heliogabalum consecravit—id agens ne quis Romæ Deus nisi Heliogabalus coleretur. Dicebat præterea, Judæorum et Samaritanorum religionem, et Christianam devotionem illuc transferendam.' Lampridius.

Decius persecuted A. D. 250. He reigned not three years, and died in battle. Pagan writers speak well of him. He seems to have distressed the Christians partly out of spite to the memory of his predecessor Philip, who had treated them kindly, and who is thought by several to have been himself a Christian, though surely a worthless one, and no credit to us. It is more probable that Philip was a Pagan.

Gallus persecuted A. D. 251, and was killed the next year.

Valerian, who had many good qualities, yet was not only an enemy, but a very cruel enemy, to the Christians. He was taken prisoner by Sapor the Persian king, and used like a slave and a dog, and as no Roman emperor was ever treated, and died a poor miserable captive.

Æmilian, governor of Ægypt, and a violent persecutor of the Christians, set up for emperor, and was taken prisoner, and sent to Gallienus, who ordered him to be strangled, A. D. 263. 'Gallieno jubente dedit pœnas: siquidem strangulatus in carcere captivorum veterum more perhibetur.' Treb. Pollio.

Aurelian, just intending to begin a persecution, was killed, A. D. 274.

Maximinus the First, a persecutor, reigned three years, and was killed.

Diocletian, by adopting associates, and sharing the empire and the troops with them, took the most probable method to secure the lives of the emperors from the arbi-

trary insolence of the army, which with little ceremony used to kill one and set up another.

'To prevent the continual treasons of the soldiery, the emperors associated to themselves persons in whom they had confidence; and Diocletian, pretending that the weight of affairs required it, ordered that there should always be two Emperors, and two Cæsars. He judged that the four principal armies, being in the hands of those who shared the empire, would check and intimidate each other, and that the other armies not being strong enough to make an emperor of their own choosing, they would lose by slow degrees the custom of electing; and lastly, that the dignity of Cæsar being always subordinate, the power divided between four for the security of the government, would yet be, in its whole extent, and in reality, only in the hands of two.

'But what kept the military men still more in order, was, that the wealth of private persons and the public revenues being diminished, the emperors could no longer bribe them with such vast presents; so that the profit was not proportionable to the danger of making a new election.

'Moreover the *præfecti prætorio*, who for power and office were in a manner the *grand viziers* of those times, and caused emperors to be massacred at their own pleasure, that they might take their place, were greatly reduced by Constantine, who left them only civil functions, and instead of two made them four.

'Thus the lives of the emperors began to be better secured, and they died in their beds, like other men,' &c. Considérations sur les Causes de la Grandeur des Romains.

But if this change were advantageous in one respect to the rulers, it was detrimental in another to the poor subjects, who were burdened with an increase of soldiers and taxes. 'Hinc denique parti Italiæ invectum tributorum ingens malum;' says Aurelius Victor.

'Tres enim participes regni sui fecit (*Diocletianus*) in quatuor partes orbe diviso, et multiplicatis exercitibus, cum singuli eorum longe majorem numerum militum habere contenderent quam priores principes habuerant cùm soli rempublicam gererent. Adeo major esse cœperat numerus

accipientium quam dantium, ut enormitate indictionum consumtis viribus colonorum, desererentur agri, et culturæ verterentur in silvam,' &c. Lactantius de Mort. Pers. c. 7.

Yet all these precautions did not protect the emperor and his colleagues from divine vengeance. At this time was the great contest between Christ and the Roman emperors, which should prevail. They were determined to blot out the Christian name from under heaven, and the persecution was far more fierce and brutal than it had ever been, and therefore it was time for Providence to exert itself; and so indeed it did.

Diocletian persecuted A. D. 303, after which nothing prospered with him; he underwent many troubles, his senses were impaired, and he quitted the empire.

Severus, who was raised by Galerius, and therefore, like Galerius, not disposed to spare the Christians, was overthrown and put to death by Maximianus Herculius, A. D. 307.

About the same time, *Urbanus*, president of Palæstine, who had signalized himself by tormenting and destroying the Christians, met with his due reward.

'Immediately after the cruelties which he had exercised upon Pamphilus, and whilst he was still in his government, the divine vengeance overwhelmed him. He who the day before sat in the judgment-seat, exercising dominion, surrounded with guards, and ruler of all Palæstine; he who was the companion, the guest, and the most intimate and honoured friend of the tyrant, suddenly was stripped of all his dignity, and exposed to public ignominy before the face of those who had feared and reverenced him. The whole nation beheld their governor dejected, dispirited, poorly begging for mercy, and showing the meanest and most unmanly behaviour: whilst Maximinus himself, whose favour had filled him with vanity and insolence, and whose affection he had obtained by his barbarity to the innocent Christians, proved his most barbarous and inexorable enemy, and after having convicted him of many crimes, and openly shamed him at Cæsarea, condemned him to be put to death.' Eusebius de Mart. Pal. vii.

The ecclesiastical historian seems to have taken some pleasure in stigmatizing this inhuman and cowardly go-

vernor, in consigning him to everlasting infamy, and in sacrificing his worthless name to the manes of his dear friend Pamphilus.

Firmilianus, another persecuting governor, met with the same fate.

'It is proper to observe here how the governors, as well as the tyrannical emperors, were punished by God's providence: for Firmilianus, who had showed so much insolence and inhumanity to the martyrs of Jesus Christ, was condemned to die with several others, and was beheaded.' Eusebius, Mart. Pal. xi.

Maximianus Herculius, one of the persecuting emperors, was compelled to hang himself, A. D. 310.

Maximianus Galerius, of all the tyrants in his time the most cruel, and the first mover of the persecution, was seized with a grievous and horrible disease, and tormented with ulcers and worms, to such a degree that they who were ordered to attend him could not bear the stench. He then made an edict, preserved by Eusebius, in favour of the Christians, that they might pray to God for him, and he died, A. D. 311.

'The wrath of Heaven fell upon him, and afflicted him with a disease which seized his body and penetrated to his soul. An abscess was suddenly formed about his secret parts, with a fistulous ulcer, which preyed upon his bowels, and an incredible quantity of worms issued thence with an intolerable stink. For before this distemper, he had indulged his voracious appetite, and was grown extremely fat and unwieldy, and the huge mass of flesh being totally corrupted, afforded a most hideous spectacle to those who were about him. Of his physicians, some were put to death because they could not bear the suffocating stench of his body; and others were still more barbarously condemned to the same punishment, because the remedies which they applied to him were ineffectual, and they could not remove an incurable distemper.' Eusebius viii. 16.

Maxentius, an enemy to Christianity, was overthrown in battle by Constantine, and in his flight he fell into the Tiber, and was drowned, A. D. 312.

The Christians, who were thus delivered out of the han

of this tyrant, compared his death with that of Pharaoh. Eusebius ix. 9.

At this time there was a dreadful famine in the eastern part of the empire, where Maximinus reigned, and a plague which particularly affected the eyes[r], and took away the sight: upon which the Christians could not forbear observing that Maximinus had inflicted that very punishment on many thousand Christians, and had caused one of their eyes to be bored out.

The Christians signalized their piety and charity towards all persons in this public calamity, and forced even their Pagan adversaries to admire and commend their behaviour. Eusebius ix. 8.

At the same time *Maximinus* and his army suffered much in a war with the Armenians, with whom he had quarrelled because they were Christians.

Maximinus was defeated by Licinius; and then he repented, and made an edict favourable to the Christians, whom he had inhumanly oppressed and persecuted, and whose eyes he had put out. He died miserably, and upon the rack, his eyes starting out of his head through the violence of his distemper, A. D. 313. All his family were destroyed, and his wife and children put to death, and with them many persons of rank, and governors of provinces, who had been his friends and dependents, and the ministers of his cruelty in tormenting and destroying the Christians, as Pincentius, Culcianus, Theotecnus. 'Nor was his latter end like that of illustrious generals, who fighting boldly for their friends and their country, and for an honourable cause, met with a death no less honourable: but whilst his army was drawn up in the field, and ready to engage, he was lurking, and hiding his cowardly head at home; and yet he could not conceal himself from God, who suddenly struck his whole body with a sore plague, and inflicted a punishment suitable to his impieties.

[r] In the fifth century, there was a famine in Phrygia and the neighbourhood, and then a pestilence; 'Ex victus mutatione in morbum delapsi, corporibus ob nimiam inflammationem tumescentibus, oculos amittebant: simulque tussi vexati, tertio die moriebantur.' Evagrius, ii. 6.

For, being tormented with the most acute and insufferable anguish, he rolled himself upon the ground, and pined away by long fasting, so that his whole form was changed, and he looked like a withered and dried skeleton, or like a living sepulchre, where the soul was buried in a rotten and dead body. At last, through the vehemence of the inward inflammation, he lost his sight, and his eyes started out of his head; and yet still breathing and confessing his sins, he called upon Death to come and release him, which advanced slowly, and not till he had acknowledged that he deserved what he suffered, for his cruelty, and for the insults which he had committed against Jesus Christ.' Eusebius E. H. ix. 10.

'Tarsum postremo confugit (*Maximinus*). Ibi cum jam terra marique perterreretur, nec ullum speraret refugium, angore animi ac metu confugit ad mortem, quasi ad remedium malorum quæ Deus in caput ejus ingessit. Sed prius cibo se infersit ac vino ingurgitavit, ut solent hi qui hoc ultimo se facere arbitrantur. Et sic hausit venenum. Cujus vis stomacho repercussa, valere non potuit in præsens, sed in languorem malum versa pestilentiæ similem, ut diutius protracto spiritu cruciamenta sentiret. Jam sævire in eum cœperat virus; cujus vis cum præcordia ejus ureret, insustentabili dolore usque ad rabiem mentis elatus est, adeo ut per dies quatuor insania percitus haustam manibus terram velut esuriens devoraret. Deinde post multos gravesque cruciatus, cum caput suum parietibus infligeret, exilierunt oculi ejus de caveis. Tunc demum, amisso visu, Deum videre cœpit candidatis ministris de se judicantem. Exclamabat ergo sicut ii qui torqueri solent, et non se sed alios fecisse dicebat. Deinde quasi tormentis adactus fatebatur. Christum subinde deprecans et plorans ut suimet misereretur. Sic inter gemitus, quos tanquam cremaretur edebat, nocentem spiritum detestabili genere mortis efflavit.' Lactantius de Mort. Pers. c. 49.

Eusebius, Chrysostom, Epiphanius, and Lactantius (as he is commonly called) agree that Maximinus lost his eyesight before he died. In the circumstances wherein Lactantius and Eusebius differ, the preference seems due to Eusebius, as to one who might be better informed of the

truth, and who was less inclined to embellish it with common reports.

'After this, most of the enemies of our religion were despoiled of all their honours. All the rulers of provinces were put to death, who had acted on the side of Maximinus, and who to please him had cruelly treated the Christians, as Pincentius his principal favourite,—Culcianus, who had destroyed so many Christians in Ægypt;—together with several others who had assisted in establishing and supporting his tyranny. Nor did the divine justice suffer Theotecnus, one of our violent persecutors, to escape unpunished.' Eusebius ix. 11.

A Roman officer, (whose name Eusebius hath not recorded) to oblige Maximinus, oppressed the Christians at Damascus, and spread calumnies against them; and not long after he died by his own hands, says Eusebius, and inflicted upon himself the punishment due to his wickedness. E. H. ix. 5, 6.

Licinius, the last of these persecutors, was conquered and put to death by Constantine, A. D. 323. This worthless and stupid prince could not read or write his own name, and hated all men of learning as much as he did the Christians.

'His education, rustic, and suitable to his mean and obscure birth, made him totally ignorant of letters. He was a declared enemy to all learning, and called it the pest and the poison of the state; but he had a particular hatred for the profession of the law. He also took a delight in tormenting the most illustrious philosophers, and in making them suffer the punishments inflicted on the vilest slaves, for crimes laid to their charge of which they were innocent.' Tillemont, Hist. des Emp. iv. p. 103.

Thus perished this foe to religion, liberty, and literature; whose memory will not perish, but stink through all ages:

Καὶ λίην κεῖνός γε ἐοικότι κεῖται ὀλέθρῳ·
Ὣς ἀπόλοιτο καὶ ἄλλος, ὅτις τοιαῦτά γε ῥέζοι·

The Christians had an illustrious friend and protector in *Constantius*, the father of Constantine, although he was a Pagan. He lived highly honoured, and greatly beloved

by his subjects; his reign was prosperous, he died in peace, leaving several children, of whom the eldest succeeded in his dominions, and became master of the Roman empire.

After Christianity was thus established, the emperor *Julian* renounced the faith in which he had been educated, and oppressed the Christians, and endeavoured to restore Paganism. But having reigned a short time, he was cut off in the midst of his days, and perished in his rash and unhappy expedition against the Persians. As this prince had his good as well as his bad qualities, Providence seems to have permitted him to fall in battle, and to die an honourable death.

They who were employed or permitted by Julian to persecute the Christians, are said to have perished miserably and remarkably. Tillemont gives us the following account of them, faithfully collected from antient fathers and ecclesiastical historians, which probably contains many truths, mixed with some exaggeration and embellishment; for such was the genius of those times, that doubt and diffidence is unavoidable, where angels, and devils, and monks, and miracles, and visions, and divine judgments, are the subject. The apparitions of armed men, and the revelations which were made to Christians of Julian's death, may justly be taken in the lump as so many pious frauds.

'We have observed that *Count Julian*, with *Felix*, superintendant of the finances, and *Elpidius*, treasurer to the emperor, apostates all three, had received orders to go and seize the effects of the church of Antioch, and carry them to the treasury. They did it on the day of the martyrdom of St. Theodoret, and drew up an account of what they had seized. But Count Julian was not content with taking away the sacred vessels of the church, and with profaning them by his impure hands: carrying to greater lengths the outrage he was doing to Jesus Christ, he overturned and flung them down on the ground, and sat upon them in a criminal manner, so as to commit actions which one dare not name, adding to this all the banters and blasphemies that he could devise against Christ and against the Christians, who, he said, were abandoned of God. Euzoïus, bishop of the Arians, who were still in possession

of the great church, opposing himself to these sacrileges, received from him a blow on the face.'

'Felix, the superintendant, signalized himself also by another impiety; for, as he was viewing the rich and magnificent vessels which the emperors Constantine and Constantius had given to the church; Behold, said he, with what plate the son of Mary is served! It is said that Count Julian and he made it the subject of banter, that God should let them thus profane his temple, without interposing by visible miracles.

'But their impieties remained not long unpunished; and Julian had no sooner profaned the sacred utensils, than he felt the effect of divine vengeance. He passed the following night with much disquiet, and the next morning he presented to the emperor an inventory of all that had been seized in the church, and then he informed him of what he had done the evening before, with relation to St. Theodoret. He had done it with a view to please that prince: but the emperor told him plainly that he approved not his putting a Christian to death for no other cause than his religion, and in the very place where he (the emperor) was, which would make it believed that it was done by his secret orders. He complained that this would afford an occasion to the Galilæans to write against him, as they had written against his predecessors, and to make a saint and a martyr of Theodoret. He absolutely commanded him, not only to put no more Christians to death, but to suffer none else to do it.

The count, who little expected such a reception and reply, remained greatly confounded. The emperor, to comfort him, told him that he should go along with him to sacrifice to the Gods, and by that means to obtain the remission of his fault: and the priests of the idols having presented to the emperor some fowls and other food which had been offered to the devil, he ate of them, and gave some to his uncle. The respect and fear with which the count was seized, permitted him not to eat much. He then retired to his own house, vexed that he had done an odious action, and had also displeased the emperor, so that he would not take any nourishment.

'Yet the little that he had eaten would not digest, and

in the evening he had a disorder in his bowels which gave him violent pain. He fell into a grievous and unknown disease, and his inward parts being corrupted, he cast out his liver and his excrements, not from the ordinary passages, but from his miserable mouth, which had uttered so many blasphemies. His secret parts, and all the flesh round about them corrupted also, and bred worms; and to show that it was a divine punishment, all the art of the physicians could give him no relief, though on account of his high rank, and his near relation to the emperor, they employed all kind of remedies. They killed a great number of the choicest and fattest birds, and applied them to the rotten places, to draw out the worms; but the worms, instead of coming forth, entered deeper into his flesh, devouring all that was corrupted, and penetrating to the quick. They got into his stomach, and from time to time came out of his mouth, whilst, to increase his affliction, the very Pagans made a jest of it. Philostorgius says that he remained forty days without speech or sense. He then came to himself a little, and his wife, who, as it is reported, was illustrious for her faith, and who had warned him to spare at least the lives of the Christians, represented to him that he ought to acknowledge and bless the mercy of Jesus Christ, who in chastizing him showed him his power; whereas if he had left him unpunished, and used his ordinary forbearance, he would never have known whom he had set at defiance. This miserable man, pressed by these remonstrances of his wife, and by the sense of his pain, acknowledged that this was the true cause of his sufferings; he detested the crime which was thus severely punished, and bare testimony of his own impiety. He called upon the God of the Christians, and entreated him to have pity on him, or at least to take him soon out of the world; and he pressed his wife to go and pray for him at church, and to desire the prayers of the Christians. But for all this, he appeared to have been no more converted than Antiochus: and he is said to have put to death several Christians only three days before he ended his life. His wife also declared to him that she dared not pray for his recovery, lest she should draw down divine wrath upon herself.

'Yet he entreated the emperor to restore to the Christians the churches which he had taken from them, and to cause them to be opened; but he could not obtain from him even that favour, and received only this answer: "It was not I who shut them up, (*except the principal church*) but I will give no orders to have them set open." At another time the count sent him word that it was because of him, and of having quitted Christianity for his sake, that he suffered such grievous pain, and perished miserably; to which Julian, without fearing the hand of God, or showing at least some compassion for a person so nearly related, sent him this reply: "You have not been faithful to the Gods, and it is for that you suffer such torments."

'At length the imposthumes all over his body, and the worms which gnawed him continually, reduced him to the utmost extremity. He threw them up, without ceasing, the last three days of his life, with a stench which he himself could not bear. Thus he ended his life by a shameful and miserable death, passing from a punishment of many days to a punishment of eternal duration. He died, if we may believe Philostorgius, whilst they were reading to him divers responses lately made by oracles, all of them promising that he should not die of any distemper. His nephew Julian lamented him as little dead, as living; and resolving not to give glory to Christ, he continued to declare that his calamity befel him for not having been faithful to the Gods. In one of his writings he says of him, that he had governed the city of Antioch with much justice, but he immediately adds, not with sufficient prudence. He there speaks of his death without adventuring to touch upon any of its circumstances.

'The disease with which God visited Felix the superintendant, was not not so long; for it carried him off in the space of a day, if not more speedily. St. Chrysostom says that he burst suddenly in the middle of his body, by which perhaps he meant what Philostorgius relates, that one of his larger veins bursting, without any straining, the blood flowed from his mouth all the night, or all the day, according to Theodoret: so that in the evening, his blood being all gone, he lost his life, as well as count Julian, and fell into everlasting death. Ammianus entirely agrees

with this, saying that he died suddenly, of a loss of blood.

'There was, it seems, a public place, where were written the names of those who died, and the people reading there the names of *Felix*, (a title usually given to emperors,) and of *Julian*, added that of *Augustus*, as if it had been the emperor himself who was deceased; and this was looked upon as a presage that he would soon be amongst the dead.

'Elpidius the treasurer, who with Julian and Felix went to pillage the church, was also punished as well as they, though a little later: for, being convicted of having favoured the revolt of Procopius against Valens, A. D. 366, he was stripped of his effects, and shut up in prison, where after having continued for some time, he died without reputation and honour, cursed of all the world, and surnamed Elpidius the sacrificer, or the apostate.

'A fourth, who according to Philostorgius had a share in the same sacrilege, and had shamefully profaned the holy altar, was instantly punished like count Julian; for those parts of his body which he had abused in committing his crime were ulcerated, and the worms which bred in them destroyed him miserably.

'The justice of God was also made manifest by many punishments of the same kind inflicted on other apostates; and it may not be amiss to collect what history hath preserved concerning it.

'One who was called *Hero*, a native of Thebes in Ægypt, and bishop of that place, as the Alexandrian Chronicle seems to say, having voluntarily renounced the faith at Antioch, was instantly seized with a disease which corrupted all his body, and made him a hideous spectacle, and a dreadful example of divine justice. He was seen lying in the streets and public places, deprived of all assistance, and even of the pity and compassion of the beholders. The Christians abhorred his perfidy, and the Pagans, after they had seduced him, showed him no regard. Thus he expired miserably in the sight of all the world.

'*Theotecnus*, a presbyter of Antioch, fell voluntarily into the same crime, deluded by fair promises, and was punished

as instantly and as severely as Hero. His flesh in a short time was corrupted and overrun with worms, and he lost his sight. At last he went mad, and bit and devoured his own tongue, and from these torments passed to others far more terrible.

'We must not omit the punishment which befell one *Thalassius*, a man famous for his impurities and debauchery, who is said even to have prostituted his own daughter. He died buried under the ruins of his house which fell upon him. Theophanes assures us that his wife, and all his household who professed Christianity, were preserved from this disaster; and a child of seven years old, being asked how he had escaped, answered that he was carried out by an angel. The Alexandrian Chronicle places the death of Theotecnus, Hero, and Thalassius, in the year 363.

'St. Gregory Nazianzen marks out in general the stories which we have related, and adds divers particularities, but without naming the persons. Who, says he, could describe the tragical accidents, the diseases, the different plagues and punishments with which divine justice visited the impious, each of them in a manner suitable to his crime? Some burst asunder in the sight of all men, others were taken off by extraordinary deaths. In the midst of their torments they confessed their crimes with a fruitless and unavailing grief: Some by dreams of the night, others by visions of the day, had their impiety set before them. Who, I say, could enumerate all the calamities by which God in a visible manner avenged the demolition of the churches, the injuries done to the holy table, the profanation of the sacred vessels, and the cruel usage of the servants of Jesus Christ?' H. E. vii. 395.

A deacon, called Cyril, in the time of Constantius, had signalized himself by destroying several images of the gods at Heliopolis. The Pagans were so enraged at this, that when Julian reigned, they seized and slew Cyril, and ripped open his belly, and ate his liver. The divine vengeance pursued all those who had been guilty of this crime; their teeth came out, their tongues rotted, and they lost their sight. So says Theodoret, iii. 7.

Valens, who was made emperor A. D. 364, was a Christian; but being of the Arian party, and of a cruel temper, he became a persecutor of the Consubstantialists. Fourscore presbyters came to him to complain of the ill usage which they had received from the Arians, whereupon it is reported that he caused them to be put to sea, and burnt alive in the ship. Afterwards, in a battle with the Goths, he was defeated and wounded, and fled to a cottage, where he was burnt alive, as most historians relate. All agree that he perished. See Socrates iv. 16. 38. and the notes.

The Consubstantialists called his death a judgment: but if so, it was rather a punishment of his cruelty, than of his heresy; of his cruelty, which was exercised not only on the party which he disliked, but on all his subjects.

A. D. 394. Theodosius, after having been almost defeated, and reduced to great distress, obtained a signal victory over Eugenius, which was generally thought to have been by a particular providence, commanding the storms to fight for him. So say Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, Rufinus, Ambrose, Augustin, Orosius, &c. and it is thus elegantly represented by Claudian, though a Pagan:

> 'Te propter gelidis Aquilo de monte procellis
> Obruit adversas acies, revolutaque tela
> Vertit in auctores, et turbine repulit hastas.
> O nimium dilecte Deo, cui fundit ab antris
> Æolus armatas hiemes; cui militat æther,
> Et conjurati veniunt ad classica venti!'

The Christians to this added other embellishments suitable to the taste of those times, as that the victory was foretold by cœlestial visions, dreams, and dæmoniacs, and obtained by the aid of John the Baptist, the tutelar saint of Theodosius.

Supposing it to have been the effect of a particular providence, which might be the case, good reasons may be assigned for it:

Arbogastes, a general, and a man of great authority, basely murdered his young emperor Valentinian II. and set up Eugenius in his place. Arbogastes was a Pagan and an enemy to Christianity, and Eugenius the usurper was a

sort of nominal Christian[s], who took every step to endear himself to the Pagans, and from whose favour they expected great things. We may therefore look upon this war as upon a struggle between Paganism and Christianity, in which the latter, by God's blessing, was superior, without ascribing the success to the orthodoxy of the emperor, and to the intervention of saints. See Tillemont, Hist. des Emp. v. 356, &c.

Theodosius, when he was to engage with Eugenius, shut himself in a church one night to pray, and falling asleep, he saw in a vision two men in white apparel, on white horses, who promised him that they would assist him; the one was St. Philip the Apostle, and the other St. John the Evangelist. Theodoret, v. 24.

In Tillemont's Hist. des Emp. t. v. this important vision is represented 'en taille-douce,' in a print, in the frontispiece, as the most signal occurrence in the fourth century.

The story seems to have been borrowed from the old Pagan story of Castor and Pollux, who fought for the Romans, and appeared 'equis candidis insidentes,' as the Roman historians inform us. The only thing wanted to complete the parallel was, that the apostles should have stroked the emperor's beard, and turned it red.

Whilst the battle was fought, a dæmoniac at Constantinople was raised up in the air, and began to curse John the Baptist, and to reproach him that he had been beheaded, and to scream out, It is you who conquer me and destroy my army. Sozom. vii. 24.

Either the devil and Sozomen, or else Theodoret, seem to have made a mistake; for the two first ascribe the victory to John the Baptist, and the third to John the Evangelist.

The last Pagan prince who was a formidable enemy to Christianity, was *Radagaisus*, a king of the Goths. He threatened no less than the ruin of the Roman empire, and invaded it with an army, as it is said, of four hundred thousand men, about A. D. 405. The Romans were saved from the hand of this barbarian, and slew him, and obtained a most signal victory, which they ascribed to a

[s] Philostorgius says that he was a Pagan, p. 538.

particular providence. Tillemont has collected with his usual accuracy what is recorded concerning this great deliverance. Hist. des Emp. v. 538. S. Basnage also hath given a large account of it, Annal. iii. 212.

Radagaisus had vowed to sacrifice all the Romans to his Gods. The Pagans in Rome and in Italy, who still were numerous, imputed these calamities to the introduction of Christianity, and to the suppression of Paganism, and were disposed to rebel and to re-establish their old religious rites.

But the Romans, commanded by Stilicho, obtained a complete victory, without any loss of men, and Radagaisus, together with his sons, was taken prisoner, and put to death.

Baronius assures us that the victory was owing to the assistance of Ambrose, though Augustin, and Orosius, who give the glory of it to God, might have taught him better.

If bigotry and political godliness did not eat up all shame, Christians would not presume to ascribe a wonderful deliverance to Ambrose, rather than to Jesus Christ, upon the authority of an obscure mortal, one Paulinus, who wrote a Life of Ambrose, full of lying miracles, and who yet has not affirmed it.

But, it seems, the Divine Providence can do nothing without the intercession of saints. 'Radagaisus besieged Florence. This city was reduced to the utmost streights, when Saint Ambrose, who had once retired thither, (and who had now been dead nine years) appeared to a person of the house where he had lodged, and promised him that the city should be delivered from the enemy on the next day. The man told it to the inhabitants, who took courage, and resumed the hopes which they had quite lost: and on the next day came Stilicho, with his army. Paulinus, who relates this, learned it from a lady who lived at Florence. And this proves what Saint Paulinus says, that God granted the preservation of the Romans to the prayers of Saint Peter, Saint Paul, and the other martyrs and confessors who were honoured by the church throughout the empire.' Tillemont, Hist. des Emp. v. p. 540.

One might have asked Saint Paulinus, the bishop of Nola, Where wert *thou*, when the apostles and martyrs made supplication for the Romans? didst thou stand by

and hear them? Say no more about it, but go thy ways and cut chips out of *the cross*, which, as thou hast told us, *grows again as fast as it is diminished.*

Hunneric, the Vandal, was an Arian, a cruel prince, and a most inhuman persecutor of the Consubstantialists, A. D. 484. This barbarian spared not even those of his own sect, or his own friends and kindred. His end, as historians relate, was suitable to his iniquities, and such as he would have equally deserved if he had been a Consubstantialist, and had destroyed the Arians. His sufferings, supposing them to be divine judgments, prove nothing at all as to the controversy; but only this, that God hates tyranny and cruelty, the wickedness of which is a clear and uncontested point.

'Dum diris cruciatibus ecclesiam Africanam lacerat Hunnericus, sensit non mortalibus, sed Christo injuriam se fecisse, elementis ipsis primum ad pœnas impio irrogandas festinantibus. Pluviâ negatâ, remansit lurida terræ facies: nullis arbores frondibus, nullis segetibus tellus cooperiebatur. Lues gravem animalibus et hominibus cladem immittebat. Juvenum, senum, adolescentium, adolescentularum, puerorum agmina simul et funera passim diffundebantur. Catervatim Carthaginem confluebant animata cadavera. Miseros ea urbe pelli rex e vestigio jubet, *ne contagio deficientium commune pararet etiam exercitui ejus sepulchrum.* Neque multo post regio corpori horrenda pœna irrogatur, quam Victoris verbis referemus: *Tenuit sceleratissimus Hunnericus dominationem regni, annis septem, mensibus decem, meritorum suorum mortem consummans. Nam putrefactum et ebulliens vermibus non corpus, sed partes corporis ejus videntur esse sepultæ.* Multa de suo, vel ex falso rumore petita, tragicæ Hunnerici morti addidit Gregorius Turonensis: *Hunnericus post tantum facinus arreptus a dæmone, qui diu de sanctorum sanguine pastus erat, propriis se morsibus laniabat. In quo etiam cruciatu vitam indignam justa morte finivit.*

Dirum magni regis supplicium ubique locorum clamat,

'Discite justitiam moniti, nec temnite Christum.'

S. Basnage Ann. iii. p. 570.

There is nothing improbable in Victor's account; but yet he is a writer who deals so much in the marvellous, that there is no trusting him. More credit ought to be given to the excellent Thuanus, who thus represents the barbarities and the death of some modern persecutors.

In the reign of Francis the first, the remainders of the *Vaudois* were massacred by the French Catholics, with the utmost brutality. 'The baron *D'Oppede*, who conducted the affair, was called to account for it, and was screened and protected by some great men; but not long after, this inhuman wretch was seized with racking pains in his bowels, and died in most miserable anguish; and God, who suffered him to escape the punishment which his judges ought to have inflicted upon him, punished him himself in a severer manner.'

A Roman monk, called *John*, signalized himself at that time in persecuting these poor innocent people. 'He invented a new kind of torment; he put their legs into boots full of boiling tallow, and then laughing at them, he asked them if they were not well equipped for their journey. Having heard that the parliament of Aix, by orders from the king, had condemned him, he fled to Avignon, where being screened from men, and from human courts of justice, he could not escape Divine Vengeance. He was stripped of all his effects by his domestics, and reduced to a state of beggary: his body was covered all over with loathsome ulcers, and he lived long in this horrible condition, often wishing for death, which came not, till he had endured dreadful torments.' See Le Clerc, Bibl. Ch. xxvii. 1.

Philip de Comines, who wrote the History of *Lewis the eleventh* of France, could not avoid observing that the divine vengeance was conspicuous in returning to this most wicked prince the evil which he had inflicted upon others, and in making his punishment suitable to his offences. Many memorable and striking instances of this kind might be produced from modern historians.

In the Scriptures there are examples of saints as well as of sinners, who suffered in this life according to the law of retaliation. St. Paul was consenting to the stoning of Stephen; and though God forgave him, yet he permitted

him to be used by the Jews as he and the Jews had used Stephen and other Christians, and he was banished, imprisoned, beaten, scourged, and three times stoned.

It is observable, that from the beginning of the reign of Tiberius down to Constantine, the Romans, even omitting the colleagues of the emperors, and those usurpers who set themselves up against them, had no less than *thirty-seven* emperors, whose reigns, one with another, amount only to *seven* years for each. Take the same space of time in the English history, from William the Conqueror, and you have no more than *eleven* kings, and their reigns will be of *twenty-seven* years, one with another.

This very quick succession of the Roman emperors for the first three centuries, the violent and untimely death by which many of them perished, the empire often falling into the hands of persons not related to their predecessors, but their enemies and rivals, and not disposed to adopt their private views and animosities, was of singular advantage to Christianity, and made the persecutions less violent and less lasting than they would else have been, and may very reasonably be looked upon as providential.

Let us now see what the prophets have delivered concerning these events.

The hundred-and-tenth Psalm is a direct and literal prophecy of Christ:

'1. The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool.

'2. The Lord shall send the rod of thy strength out of Zion: rule thou in the midst of thine enemies.

'3. Thy people *shall be* willing in the day of thy power, in the beauties of holiness from the womb of the morning: thou hast the dew of thy youth.

'4. The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou *art* a priest for ever, after the order of Melchizedek.

'5. The Lord at thy right hand shall strike through kings in the day of his wrath.

'6. He shall judge among the Heathen, he shall fill *the places* with the dead bodies: he shall wound the heads over many countries.

'7. He shall drink of the brook in the way; therefore shall he lift up his head.'

The second Psalm is of the same kind:

'1. Why do the Heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing?

'2. The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord, and against his anointed, *saying*,

'3. Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us.

'4. He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh: the Lord shall have them in derision.

'5. Then shall he speak unto them in his wrath, and vex them in his sore displeasure.

'6. Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion.

'7. I will declare the decree: the Lord hath said unto me, Thou *art* my son, this day have I begotten thee.

'8. Ask of me, and I shall give *thee* the Heathen *for* thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth *for* thy possession.

'9. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron, thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel.

'10. Be wise now therefore, O ye kings: be instructed, ye judges of the earth.

'11. Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling.

'12. Kiss the son, lest he be angry, and ye perish *from* the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little; blessed *are* all they that put their trust in him.'

This Psalm seems in a lower sense applicable to David; but it suits much better with the Messias, especially when compared with *the hundred-and-tenth*, which is a key to it, and the apostles apply it to Christ.

No person ever lived before David, and none ever yet arose after him, to whom the cxth Psalm could be applied, besides Jesus Christ.

David was a king, he was a great and victorious king, he was a king by divine election and appointment, he was a prophet, he was called a man after God's own heart, not because he was a better man than many of his subjects, for he was guilty of several faults, but because, as a king, he kept up the true religion, and made the laws of God to be observed in his dominions, and never fell into idolatry;

and upon all these accounts he could have no superior upon earth, none who could be his Lord. A great king, a promised Messias was to arise; but as he was to be the son of David, he must have been in that respect inferior to his father, and it seemed unnatural that David should pay homage to his own child. This difficulty our Saviour proposed to the Jews: they could not solve it, and he would not; but his design was to intimate to them that the Messias was a greater person than they apprehended, and that though he were inferior to David as he was the son of David, he was superior to him as he was the son of God.

'While the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus asked them, saying, What think ye of Christ? Whose son is he? They say unto him, The son of David. He saith unto them, How then doth David in spirit call him Lord, saying, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool? If David then call him Lord, how is he his son? And no man was able to answer him a word.'

Besides, what relation could there be of lord and servant between David and the Messias, when David was dead, or before the Messias was born, unless the Messias existed before his appearance upon earth, and were the Lord not only of the living, but of the dead; that is, of those who though dead to men, yet lived to him, and were his servants?

David therefore is to be thus understood; The Lord Jehovah hath said to my Lord the Messias, Thou shalt sit at my right hand, invested with divine power, and next in dignity to me.

In this Psalm there are some expressions which are ambiguous and obscure; but setting aside grammatical and critical difficulties, and attending to those parts of it which are plain, we find it foretold here that a person should arise, who should be greater than David, who should be a king, who should rule in the midst of his enemies, who should be an everlasting priest, and who by the assistance of God should overthrow kings and armies that opposed him. These predictions were evidently accomplished in Christ.

By comparing this Psalm with other prophecies we may

observe that the person here mentioned was to be the son of David. It hath been universally agreed upon by Jews and Christians, that the Messias should be the son of David, for these reasons.

God promised to David, not only that he should have a son to reign after him, but that the kingdom should be continued to his family. Thus in the First Book of Samuel, vii. 12. 'I will set up thy seed after thee—Thy house and thy kingdom shall be established for ever.' In Psalm lxxxix. 'I have found David my servant—My mercy will I keep for him for evermore, and my covenant shall stand fast with him; his seed will I make to endure for ever.' In the cxxxiid Psalm it is also declared; 'I will make the horn of David to bud, I have ordained a lamp for mine anointed.' 'Horn' means a 'king,' and the expression of 'budding' is taken from trees, which shoot forth branches.

Isaiah says, 'I will make an everlasting covenant with you, even the sure mercies of David.' That is, I will fulfil what I promised to David, lv. 3. And again; 'In that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek, and his rest shall be glorious,' xi. 10. 'And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots. And the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him,' &c. xi. 1. This was said long after the death of David, so that the promised person was not yet come, but was to appear in future times.

Afterwards Jeremiah thus prophesies: 'Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous branch, and a king shall reign and prosper, and shall execute justice and judgment in the earth.—And this is his name, whereby he shall be called, *The Lord our righteousness*.' xxiii. 5.

Zechariah, who prophesied after the return from the captivity, taught the people to expect a great person, 'The servant of God, the Branch,' that is, the 'Branch of Jesse,' the man whose name was 'the Branch,' who should build the temple, and be a *king* and a *priest* upon the throne. vi. 12.

Many other prophecies there are concurring in this, that

a person should arise, who should be the son of David, and a great and illustrious prince; and he is called *David* by Hosea, Jeremiah, and Ezechiel. 'The children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, &c.—Afterwards shall the children of Israel return, and seek the Lord their God, and David their king,' Hosea iii. 4, 5. 'But they shall serve the Lord their God, and David their king, whom I will raise up unto them,' Jeremiah xxx. 9. And I will set up one shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David; he shall feed them, and he shall be their shepherd. And I the Lord will be their God, and my servant David a prince among them, I the Lord have spoken it.' Ezechiel xxxiv. 23, 24.

The most probable reason why the Messias is called *David*, is, that David was a type of him, and said many things, seemingly of himself, which by the Spirit of God were intended of the Messias. Either these prophecies were accomplished in Christ, or they never have been accomplished at all; but with Christ they correspond exactly.

2. The person mentioned in this Psalm was to be greater than David. This is too plain to want any further proof: 'The Lord said unto my Lord.' And this was accomplished in Christ, if he were, as we learn from the Gospel, the Son of God in a sense most peculiar and high.

3. He was to be a king. 'Sit thou at my right hand: Rule thou in the midst.' This also is evident; and it was accomplished in Christ, who hath been acknowledged for a king by all his numerous subjects, from his resurrection to the present time. To sit at the right hand of God cannot mean less than to be next in honour and dignity to God, and therefore to be exalted, not only above all men, but above all creatures. This dignity was never conferred upon any man, except Christ, who, as the writers of the New Testament affirm, was received up into heaven, and was seen of Stephen appearing at the right hand of God.

But, further, it may be inferred from this Psalm that he was to be an everlasting king. It is said that he should be king and priest, and an everlasting priest, and consequently an everlasting king also. It is likewise said, 'Sit thou at my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool,'

which was never accomplished in any of David's posterity except in Christ, in whom so much of the prediction hath been fulfilled as to be a sufficient earnest for the completion of the whole promise. Hence St. Paul proves Christ's everlasting kingdom: Christ must reign, says he, till all things, and all enemies are subdued and put under his feet. This is not yet accomplished, nor will be till the end of the world; for he hath and he will have his enemies who will not be subject to him; and besides, as he hath promised to overcome Death, and to confer everlasting life upon his servants, and as Death still reigns and will reign over them here below, during this state of things, his dominion will not be complete till Death is no more, and his servants are raised up by him at the last day, to live with him for ever. 1 Cor. xv.

4. It is said, in the third verse, of this person,—'from the womb of the morning[t] thou hast the dew of thy youth;' which words are obscure. The reading of the LXX is very different and remarkable; 'Before the morning star I begat thee.' Ἐκ γαστρὸς πρὸ ἑωσφόρου ἐγέννησά σε. If this be right[v], which I take not upon me to determine, it contains an intimation that this great person was the Son of God before the creation, and in a high and peculiar sense, and not like other good men; and in the second Psalm it is said, 'Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.'

5. In the fourth verse, 'Thou art a priest[w] for ever after the order of Melchizedek,' might also be rendered, 'Thou art a priest for ever, because thou art a just king[x].'

[t] A friend of mine says, 'I render the words thus; From the womb, from *that which was* thy morning, thy youth was a dew: i. e. as agreeable and refreshing as dew is in hot countries. This is a literal version, and is sense.'

[v] See 'Critical Notes on some Passages of Scripture,' p. 54.

[w] Sacerdos, aut minister. Grotius. Vox *Chohen* significat quidem interdum principem, eumque intimæ admissionis, ut diximus ad 2 Sam. viii. 18. 1 Reg. iv. 5. Sed de rege proprie dicto nusquam occurrit. Ideoque LXX Intt. σὺ ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. Quod Jesu Christo soli convenit,' &c. Clericus.

[x] See 'Critical Notes,' &c. 'Noster textus Hebræus habet, *Secundum meum constitutionem, o rex mi juste.*' Grotius.

But what interpretation soever be followed here, it is plain that he was to be an everlasting priest. 'The Lord sware, and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever.' This promise is introduced with great solemnity, and confirmed with an oath, and it is of a singular kind, since no such promise is made in the Old Testament to any other person. According to the system of the Gospel, it was accomplished in Christ, who is our everlasting Redeemer and Intercessor.

The consequences of this promise were, that the Messias must live for ever, and not be subject to the dominion of death, else he could not be an everlasting priest; and that he could have no successor in the priesthood, since it would never be vacant; and that the Jewish priesthood and the ceremonial law must be abolished, and give place to another institution and covenant, and that the priesthood must be changed, and pass from the family of Aaron and the tribe of Levi to the family of David, and to the tribe of Judah, whence this Messias was to spring.

6. 'The Lord shall send the rod of thy strength out of Zion: rule thou in the midst of thine enemies.'

When the Gospel of Christ, first preached at Jerusalem, and thence spreading itself through the world, had been received by a multitude of Jews and Gentiles, this prediction began to be accomplished, and it was further fulfilled when Christianity was established in the Roman empire.

7. In this Psalm it is plainly and expressly foretold that the Messias should be a victorious king, that he should have kings and rulers for his enemies, and that they should be overthrown and perish. This, as we have showed, was remarkably fulfilled in Christ.

8. In the sixth verse, 'He shall wound the heads over many countries,' may be translated, 'he shall crush the head (that ruled) over many countries.' 'Confodiet caput quod multis terris præerat.' Clericus.

9. In the seventh verse, 'He shall drink of the brook in the way; therefore shall he lift up his head.' That is, says Le Clerc, 'He (who was head over many countries) shall drink of the brook in the way; therefore he (the conqueror) shall lift up his head; Maxentius and his host

shall be drowned in the Tiber, and lay his head there, and Constantine shall lift up his head, and triumph over him.' This Le Clerc proposes, but modestly and with diffidence. The thought is ingenious, and to drink of the brook may mean to be drowned, as in Homer, Odyss. Δ. 511.

Ὡς ὁ μὲν ἔνθ' ἀπόλωλεν, ἐπεὶ πίεν αἰλμυρὸν ὕδωρ.

Ovid Epist. vii. 62.

'Neu bibat æquoreas naufragus hostis aquas.'

But perhaps it would be more natural to understand it thus of the same person: 'As a pursuing conqueror takes a hasty draught at the first fountain in the way, and loses no time in refreshing himself,—so God, or the Messias, shall speedily subdue his enemies, and lift up his victorious head.' Soon after Diocletian began to persecute, the divine vengeance began to attack him and his wicked colleagues, and swept them off from the earth one after another.

We have showed the completion of these predictions in the establishment of Christianity, and in the destruction of those tyrants who rose up against it, and who became as the dung of the earth. It is no wonder that our Saviour and his apostles[y] insisted so much on this Psalm, as on a prophecy, direct and plain, which, when it was accomplished, was so strong a proof of their divine mission, and of the authority both of the Old Testament and of the New.

The apostles have applied some parts of this Psalm to Christ, and they knew that the whole would be accomplished in him; yet in their discourses and writings they avoided a particular mention of the destruction which should fall upon the persecuting princes, probably because they would not offend the Roman emperors, and give malicious men an opportunity of accusing the Christians as bad subjects, and as enemies to the government.

But we will not dissemble another interpretation which hath been given of this Psalm.

[y] Matt. xxii. 44. Mark xii. 36. Luke xx. 42. Acts ii. 34. 1 Cor. xv. 25. Hebr. i. 13. v. 6. vii. 17.

'It was made, say they, by David, for the use of the people, of his subjects, who were to rehearse it in the house of God, at the tabernacle.

'It relates in its primary sense to David, and the meaning of the first verse is, "The Lord Jehovah hath said to my Lord (king David), Sit thou," &c. It is true that David was nó *priest*, but the word *chohen* is ambiguous, and may mean either a priest, or an intimate friend of the king, who hath free admission to his presence, one of the great courtiers; according to which sense the fourth verse may be interpreted, "Thou art, of all the sons of men, my principal favourite, who hast free access to me."

'But then this Psalm, like many other prophecies, hath a double sense, and is applicable to the Messias, and is much more eminently accomplished in him than it ever was in David.'

This interpretation hath been proposed and adopted by Ruarus, and by some other Socinians. See Ruari Epist. t. ii. p. 116.

Now, if we should admit this double sense, yet it must be observed that Christ applied this Psalm to himself, that the apostles applied it to him, and that their interpretation was fully justified by a long train of various events, and by the accomplishment of the whole prediction in Christ, which is an irrefragable proof that they understood it rightly.

But there is no admitting this double meaning without adopting a precarious hypothesis, contradicting the general opinion of the Jews in the time of Christ, rejecting the version of the LXX, which translates *chohen*, ἱερεὺς, according to the usual sense of the word, and offering violence to some parts of the Psalm, which cannot be applied to David, unless in a sense very low and flat, 'sensu valde diluto.' David could not say of himself, 'The Lord said unto my Lord,' nor did he sit at the right hand of God, exalted above men and angels, nor were all his enemies subdued under his feet, nor did they whom he conquered pay him a willing obedience, nor was he an everlasting priest, or an everlasting king, nor was his dominion extensive over the nations and the Gentiles.

'Davidis revera fuisse Psalmum testatur Christus, et Petrus. Uterque ostendit, vi verborum, de Christo agi, non de alio; qua in re non aptantur ei verba, quæ et alii convenire queant, ut interdum fit in vaticiniis; sed statuuntur non aliter posse intelligi. Hoc unum non facile cuiquam concessero, hunc Psalmum non ad Jesum Christum solum et quidem directe referri oportere; quod nec diffitebatur H. Grotius, qui ceteroquin insimulatur, quasi vix ullam prophetiam directe ad Christum solum pertinere fassus sit. Quod tamen immerito viro magno objicitur.' Clericus. See his Comment on this Psalm.

THE CONDITION of the Jews under Constantine should now be considered; but I shall take the subject from an earlier date, and offer a few remarks on the state of that people from the destruction of Jerusalem to this day.

'HOWSOEVER unentertaining the History may seem to be which we have undertaken, yet it presents to the public view an object worthy of observation, and the greatest prodigy that can be imagined, namely, the preservation of the Jewish people in the midst of the miseries which they have undergone since seventeen hundred years. Religions depend on temporal prosperity; they triumph under the protection of a conqueror; they languish and sink with sinking monarchies. Paganism, which once covered the face of the earth, is extinct. The Christian church, glorious in its martyrs, yet was considerably diminished by the persecutions to which it was exposed, nor was it easy to repair the breaches in it made by those acts of violence. But here we behold a church hated and persecuted for seventeen hundred ages, and yet sustaining itself, and widely extended. Kings have often employed the severity of edicts, and the hand of executioners, to ruin it. The seditious multitudes, by murders and massacres, have committed outrages against it still more violent and tragical. Princes and people, Pagans, Mahometans, Christians, disagreeing in so many things, have united in the design of exterminating it, and have not been able to succeed. The *bush of Moses*, surrounded with flames, ever burns, and is never consumed. The Jews have been expelled, in

different times, from every part of the world, which hath only served to spread them in all regions. From age to age they have been exposed to misery and persecution. Yet still they subsist, in spite of the ignominy and the hatred which hath pursued them in all places, whilst the greatest monarchies are fallen, and nothing remains of them besides the name.

'Their misery bears its peculiar characters. In their other captivities God marked out a time in which he would be propitious, and break the yoke of tyranny, and restore to them their lost liberty. The longest, which was the Ægyptian captivity, yet lasted only a few ages. After threescore and ten years they returned from Babylon, and the persecution of Antiochus was to cease after three years and ten days: but of their present evils God hath not fixed the expiration. God comforted them under their other distresses, by heroes, or by inspired men. Ezechiel prophesied at Babylon, and Daniel, long before the event, pointed out the Messias. The Maccabees arose against the kings of Syria, and raised up the fallen glory of the nation; but hitherto none have appeared, besides false Messiahs, who, by their attempts to shake off the yoke from the people, have only increased its weight. The prophetic succession is extinct, and no sacred messenger arises to promise the end of miseries which have lasted so many ages.

'Even when God delivered them up to infidels, he preserved a body of the nation, by removing it to one place. It was entire in the vale of Goshen, when they were called out of Ægypt. Cyrus easily reunited the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, to send them back to Jerusalem. One part of the nation inhabited the same cities, and the Israelites occupied the two borders of the river Chabor; but at the destruction of Jerusalem, and afterwards in Adrian's war, the nation, enfeebled by unparalleled massacres, was dispersed through all the provinces of the empire. The dispersion is as great as it ever was, and scarcely are to be found the remains of the ten tribes in the East, where formerly they were numerous and considerable.

'The Romans, when they made themselves masters of Judæa, left to its inhabitants a public worship, and the

exercise of their laws. The synagogues, as those of Damascus, judged with authority of religious affairs, in which even the Christians were interested. The high priest was not without power. There were judges even in Chaldæa, as it appears from the History of Susanna, false as it is. But not the shadow of sovereign authority now remains; and yet the nation remains, and consists of millions.

'The judgments which God has exercised upon this people are terrible, extending to the men, the religion, and the very land in which they dwelt. The ceremonies essential to their religion can no more be observed. The ritual law, which cast a splendor on the national worship, and struck the Pagans so much that they sent their presents and their victims to Jerusalem, is absolutely fallen; for they have no temple, no altar, no sacrifices. Their land itself seems to lie under a never-ceasing curse. Pagans, Christians, Mohammedans, in a word almost all nations, have by turns seized and held Jerusalem. To the Jew only hath God refused the possession of this small tract of ground so supremely necessary for him, since he ought to worship on this mountain. A Jewish writer hath affirmed that it is long since any Jew was seen settled near Jerusalem: scarcely can they purchase there six feet of land, for a burying-place.

'In all this there is no exaggeration. I am only pointing out known facts; and far from having the least design to raise an odium against the nation from its miseries, I conclude that it ought to be looked upon as one of those prodigies which we admire without comprehending, since in spite of evils so durable, and a patience so long exercised, it is preserved by a particular Providence. The Jew ought to be weary of expecting a Messias who so unkindly disappoints his vain hopes, and the Christian ought to have his attention and his regard excited towards men, whom God preserves, for so great a length of time, under calamities which would have been the total ruin of any other people.' Basnage, Hist. des Juifs, iv. 1.

Some have observed that the preservation of the *Gypsies* is as extraordinary as that of the *Jews:* but this is thrown out by way of *jest*, which, like *gravity* and *solemnity* in

another sort of writers, often supplies the want of argument. For what comparison between the Jewish nation, and a collection of strollers of various countries, who perhaps have not existed as a body above four hundred years, who, far from dogmatizing, seem to be of no religion at all, who never appeared in arms, and made themselves formidable, whom rags and contempt have secured from violent persecution, and who, at the worst, have been only driven from place to place, which to them was no great punishment, for frauds and petty-larcenies?

T. Jackson, in his theological works, hath given a summary account of the calamities of the Jews, from the time of their rebellion against Christ: but he hath not showed the candour and the caution of Basnage; he is prejudiced against them, treats them over severely, judges too harshly, and pays too much regard to the ridiculous stories and lying slanders which have been raised by Christians against them. One would wonder how zeal could transport a good and learned man to such a degree against this miserable nation. Vol. i. p. 92, &c.

Our Saviour said to the Jews, 'I am come in my Father's name, and ye receive me not: if another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive.' This remarkable prediction of our Lord hath been evidently and frequently fulfilled: for,

In the interval between the resurrection of Christ and the destruction of Jerusalem, many *false Christs and false prophets* arose, of whom mention is made by St. Luke and by Josephus.

In the reign of Adrian, *Barcochab* pretended to be the Messias, and perished with his followers.

In the time of Theodosius the younger, A. D. 434. another impostor arose, called *Moses Cretensis*. He pretended to be a second Moses, sent to deliver the Jews who dwelt in Crete, and promised to divide the sea, and give them a safe passage through it. They assembled together, with their wives and children, and followed him to a promontory. He there commanded them to cast themselves into the sea. Many of them readily obeyed him, and perished in the waters, and many were taken up and saved

by fishermen. Upon this, the deluded Jews would have torn the impostor to pieces, but he escaped them, and was seen no more [z]. Socrates vii. 38.

Socrates relates here a story of what happened in his own days. He says not that this fellow wrought any miracles to bewitch his countrymen; unless it be supposed a sort of *miracle* to make a Jew fling away himself and his money too. It is plain that the impostor could propose neither profit nor credit by thus deluding and destroying the Jews; and therefore we may conclude that he was a frantic enthusiast, and that perhaps in the hurry and bustle he jumped down himself unseen, and was drowned.

In the reign of Justin, A. D. 520, another false prophet is said to have appeared, and to have called himself the son of Moses. His name was *Dunaan*. He entered into a city of Arabia Felix, and there he oppressed the Christians; but he was taken prisoner and put to death by Elesban, an Æthiopian general. See a fuller account of this *Dunaan*, in Fleury, H. E. t. vii. p. 272. and in Basnage Hist. des Juifs, who says that *Dunaan* was no false Messias, but a king of the Homerites. vi. 20. p. 1375.

The Jews and Samaritans of Palæstine rebelled against the emperor Justinian, A. D. 529., and set up one *Julian* for their king, and accounted him the Messias; but the Romans made a great slaughter of them, and their king was killed. *J. a Lent.* This rebellion is to be ascribed to the Samaritans, who were oppressed on account of their religion by Justinian, a wrong-headed prince, and a great persecutor of heretics. See Fleury, H. E. t. vii. p. 326.

A. D. 571. *Mohammed* was born in Arabia. He at first professed himself to be the Messias who was promised to the Jews, and he drew after him many of them, and so may claim a place in the catalogue of false Christs.

A. D. 721. Another *impostor*, a Syrian, arose in the time of Leo Isaurus; he called himself the Messias, and was received as such by the Jews.

A. D. 1137. A *false Christ* made his appearance in France. He was put to death, and many Jews suffered at

[z] ἀφανὴς γὰρ ἐγένετο.

the same time, being accused of crucifying a Christian boy once a year.

A. D. 1138. The Persians were disturbed by a Jew, who called himself *the Messias*, and collected a formidable army of his countrymen. The Persian king submitted to compound the matter with him, and hired him to disband his soldiers. But afterwards he seized and beheaded him, and made the Jews in his dominions pay him back all the money which he had given to their Messias; by which they were reduced to a state of beggary, and to a necessity of selling their children. He continued to treat them very cruelly, and subjected them to all kinds of insults.

In the same century, A. D. 1157, a *false Messias* stirred up the Jews at Corduba in Spain; upon which almost all the Jews of that kingdom were destroyed.

A. D. 1167. *Another* arose in the kingdom of Fez, who is mentioned by Maimonides.

In the same year appeared a *false prophet*, and, as it seems, an enthusiast also: it was in Arabia. He pretended to be the forerunner of the Messias. When search was made for him, his followers fled, and he was brought before the Arabian king. He was questioned by him, and replied that he was indeed a prophet sent from God. The king then asked him what sign or miracle he could show, to confirm his mission. Cut off my head, said he, and I will return to life again. The king took him at his word, promising to believe in him if it came to pass, and cut off his head. But the prophet never attempted to fasten it on again; and the Jews of Arabia had a heavy fine laid upon them. Yet some of them, says Maimonides, were so infatuated as to expect his resurrection.

Not long after this, a Jew who dwelt beyond Euphrates called himself *the Messias*, and gave this for a sign of it, that he was leprous all night, and clean all day. He perished in his attempt.

A. D. 1174. A *magician* and false Christ was seen in Persia, who brought the Jews into great tribulation.

A. D. 1176. Another arose in Moravia, who was called *David Almusser*. He pretended that he could make

himself invisible: but he was taken, and put to death, and a heavy fine was laid upon his brethren, the Jews.

Solomon Ben Virgæ mentions another *impostor*; but we know not in what year or in what place he set up his claim.

A. D. 1199. A famous cheat and a rebel exerted himself in Persia, called *David el David*, or *David Alroi*, a learned man, and a magician, who is reported to have wrought many miracles. He raised an army against the king, but was taken and imprisoned; and having escaped, was again seized, and was beheaded. Benjamin Tudelensis and Solomon Ben Virgæ have given us an account, abounding with lies, concerning the wonders wrought by this inchanter.

A. D. 1497. We find another Messias, whose name was *Ismael Sophus*, who deluded the Jews in Spain.

A. D. 1500. *Rabbi Lemlem*, a German Jew of Austria, declared himself a forerunner of the Messias, and pulled down his own oven, promising his brethren that they should bake their bread in the Holy Land the next year.

A. D. 1509. Jo. Henricus Majus, in his Life of Reuchlin, says that one *Pfefferkorn*, a Jew of Cologn, pretended to be the Messias. *Pfefferkorn* afterwards turned Christian, and joined with James Hochstrat (an inquisitor, and a man thoroughly qualified for his vile office) to plague the Jews, and to persecute Reuchlin. This quarrel excited some wit to write the 'Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum,' in which Hochstrat and his stupid monks and doctors are set in a ridiculous light, and make a very droll figure. Bayle gives an account of these disputes in his Dict. *Hochstrat.*

A. D. 1534. In Spain *Rabbi Salomo Malcho*, giving out that he was the Messias, was burnt by Charles the fifth; and the Christians were so superstitious that they stopped the rabbi's mouth, when they brought him to the stake, lest by uttering some charm he should escape out of their hands. The poor wretch was a sort of martyr; for it is said that he might have saved his life if he would have renounced Judaism.

A. D. 1615. A *false Christ* arose in the East Indies, and was followed by the Portuguese Jews.

A. D. 1624. Another in the Low Countries pretended to be *the Messias*, of the family of David, and of the line of Nathan. He promised to destroy Rome, and to overthrow the kingdom of Antichrist, and the Turkish empire.

'A. D. 1666. This was a year of great expectation, and some wonderful thing was looked for by many. This was a fit time for an impostor to set up; and accordingly lying reports were carried about. It was told about that great multitudes marched from unknown parts to the remote deserts of Arabia, and they were supposed to be the ten tribes of Israel, who have been dispersed for many ages; that a ship was arrived in the north parts of Scotland with sails and cordage of silk, that the mariners spake nothing but Hebrew, that on the sails was this motto, THE TWELVE TRIBES OF ISRAEL. Thus were credulous men possessed at that time.

'Then it was that *Sabatai Sevi* appeared at Smyrna, and professed himself to be the Messias. He promised the Jews deliverance and a prosperous kingdom. This which he promised they firmly believed. The Jews now attended to no business, discoursed of nothing but of their return, and believed Sabatai to be the Messias as firmly as we Christians believe any article of faith. A right reverend person, then in Turkey, told me, that meeting with a Jew of his acquaintance at Aleppo, he asked him what he thought of Sabatai. The Jew replied, that he believed him to be the Messias, and that he was so far of that belief, that, if he should prove an impostor, he would then turn Christian. It will be very fit I should be very particular in this relation, because the history is so very surprising and remarkable; and we have the account of it from those who were then in Turkey, and are now alive. I am so well satisfied as to the facts, that I dare vouch for the truth of the relation, and appeal for the truth of it to very many persons of great credit, who are now alive.

'*Sabatai Sevi* was the son of *Mordecai Sevi*, a mean Jew of Smyrna. Sabatai was very bookish, and arrived to a great skill in the Hebrew learning. He was the author of a new doctrine, and for it was expelled the city. He went thence to *Salonichi*, of old called Thessalonica, where he married a very handsome woman, but was divorced from

her. Then he travelled into the Morea, then to Tripoli, Gaza, and Jerusalem. By the way he picked up a third wife. At Jerusalem he began to reform the Jews' constitutions, and abolish one of their solemn fasts, and communicated his design of professing himself the Messias to one Nathan. He was pleased with it, and sets up for his *Elias* or forerunner, and took upon him to abolish all the Jewish fasts, as not beseeming, when the bridegroom was now come. Nathan prophesies that the Messias should appear before the grand seignior in less than two years, and take from him his crown, and lead him in chains.

'At Gaza, Sabatai preached repentance, together with a faith in himself, so effectually, that the people gave themselves up to their devotions and alms. The noise of this Messias began to fill all places. Sabatai now resolves for Smyrna, and then for Constantinople. Nathan writes to him from Damascus; and thus he begins his letter: "To the King, our king, Lord of Lords, who gathers the dispersed of Israel, who redeems our captivity, the man elevated to the height of all sublimity, the Messias of the God of Jacob, the true Messias, the celestial Lion, Sabatai Sevi."

'And now throughout Turkey the Jews were in great expectation of glorious times. They now were devout and penitent, that they might not obstruct the good which they hoped for. Some fasted so long that they were famished to death; others buried themselves in the earth till their limbs grew stiff; some would endure melting wax dropped on their flesh; some rolled in snow, others in a cold season would put themselves into cold water; and many whipped themselves. Business was laid aside, superfluities of household utensils were sold; the poor were provided for by immense contributions. Sabatai comes to Smyrna, where he was adored by the people, though the *Chacham* contradicted him, for which he was removed from his office. There he in writing styles himself "the only and first-born Son of God, the Messias, the Saviour of Israel." And though he met with some opposition, yet he prevailed there at last to that degree, that some of his followers prophesied, and fell into strange ecstasies: four hundred men and women prophesied of his growing kingdom; and

young infants who could hardly speak, would plainly pronounce *Sabatai, Messias*, and *Son of God*. The people were for a time possessed, and voices heard from their bowels; some fell into trances, foamed at the mouth, recounted their future prosperity, their visions of the Lion of Judah, and the triumphs of Sabatai. All which (says the relator) were certainly true, being effects of diabolical delusions, as the Jews themselves have since confessed unto me.

'Now the impostor swells and assumes. Whereas the Jews in their synagogues were wont to pray for the grand seignior, he orders those prayers to be forborne for the future, thinking it an indecent thing to pray for him who was shortly to be his captive; and instead of praying for the Turkish emperor, he appoints prayers for himself, as another author relates. And (as my author, Joannes a Lent, goes on) he elected princes to govern the Jews in their march towards the Holy Land, and to minister justice to them when they should be possessed of it. These princes were men well known in the city of Smyrna at that time. The people now were pressing to see some miracle to confirm their faith, and to convince the Gentiles. Here the impostor was puzzled, though any juggling trick would have served their turn. But the credulous people supplied this defect. When Sabatai was before the cadi (or justice of peace), some affirmed they saw a pillar of fire between him and the cadi; and after some had affirmed it, others were ready to swear it, and did swear it also; and this was presently believed by the Jews of that city. He that did not now believe him to be the Messias, was to be shunned as an excommunicate person. The impostor now declares that he was called of God to see Constantinople, where he had much to do. He ships himself, to that end, in a Turkish *saick*, in Jan. 1666. He had a long and troublesome voyage: he had not power over the sea and winds. The vizier, upon the news, sends for him, and confines him to a loathsome prison. The Jews pay him their visits; and they of this city are now as infatuated as those of Smyrna. They forbid traffic, and refused to pay their debts. Some of our English merchants, not knowing how to recover their debts from the Jews, took this occasion to visit Sabatai, and make their complaints to

him against his subjects; whereupon he wrote this following letter to the Jews:

'"To you of the nation of the Jews, who expect the appearance of the Messias, and the salvation of Israel, peace without end. Whereas we are informed that you are indebted to several of the English nation, it seemeth right unto us to order you to make satisfaction to these your just debts; which if you refuse to do, and not obey us herein, Know you that then you are not to enter with us into our joys and dominions."

'Sabatai remained a prisoner in Constantinople by the space of two months. The grand vizier, designing for Candia, thought it not safe to leave him in the city during the grand seignior's absence and his own. He therefore removed him to the *Dardanelli*; a better air indeed, but yet out of the way; and, consequently, importing less danger to the city: which occasioned the Jews to conclude that the Turks could not, or durst not, take away his life; which had, they concluded, been the surest way to have removed all jealousy.

'The Jews flocked in great numbers to the castle where he was a prisoner; not only those that were near, but from Poland, Germany, Leghorn, Venice, and other places: they received Sabatai's blessing, and promises of advancement. The Turks made use of this confluence; they raised the price of their lodgings and provisions, and put their price upon those who desired to see Sabatai, for their admittance. This profit stopped their mouths, and no complaints were for this cause sent to Adrianople.

'Sabatai, in this confinement, appoints the manner of celebrating his own nativity. He commands the Jews to keep it on the ninth day of the month *Ab*, and to make it a day of great joy, to celebrate it with pleasing meats and drinks, with illuminations and music. He obligeth them to acknowledge the love of God in giving them that day of consolation for the birth of their king Messias, Sabatai Sevi, his servant and first-born son in love.

'I only observe by the way the insolence of this impostor. This day was a solemn day of fasting among the Jews formerly, as I have showed elsewhere, in memory of the burning of the temple by the Chaldees: several other

sad things happened in this month, as the Jews observe; that then and upon the same day the second temple was destroyed; and that in this month it was decreed in the wilderness that the Israelites should not enter into Canaan, &c. Sabatai was born on this day; and therefore the fast must be turned into a feast: whereas, in truth, it had been well for the Jews had he not been born at all; and much better for himself, as will appear from what follows. But I return to my author.

'The Jews of the city paid Sabatai Sevi great respect. They decked their synagogues with S. S. in letters of gold, and made for him in the wall a crown; they attributed the same titles and prophecies to him which we apply to our Saviour.

'He was also during this imprisonment visited by pilgrims from all parts, that had heard his story. Among whom *Nehemiah Cohen* from Poland was one, a man of great learning in the Kabbala and eastern tongues; who desired a conference with Sabatai, and at the conference maintained that, according to the Scripture, there ought to be a two-fold Messias; one the son of Ephraim, a poor and despised teacher of the law; the other the son of David, to be a conqueror. Nehemiah was content to be the former, the son of Ephraim, and to leave the glory and dignity of the latter to Sabatai. Sabatai, for what appears, did not mislike this. But here lay the ground of the quarrel: Nehemiah taught that the son of Ephraim ought to be the forerunner of the son of David, and to usher him in: and Nehemiah accused Sabatai of too great forwardness, in appearing as the son of David, before the son of Ephraim had led him the way. Sabatai could not brook this doctrine; for he might fear that the son of Ephraim, who was to lead the way, might pretend to be the son of David, and so leave him in the lurch; and therefore he excluded him from any part or share in this matter; which was the occasion of the ruin of Sabatai, and all his glorious designs.

'Nehemiah, being disappointed, goes to Adrianople, and informs the great ministers of state against Sabatai, as a lewd and a dangerous person to the government, and that it was necessary to take him out of the way. The grand seignior, being informed of this, sends for Sabatai, who,

much dejected, appears before him. The grand seignior requires a miracle, and chooses one himself; and it was this: that Sabatai should be stripped naked, and set as a mark for his archers to shoot at; and if the arrows did not pierce his flesh, he would own him to be the Messias. Sabatai had not faith enough to bear up under so great a trial. The grand seignior let him know that he would forthwith impale him, and that the stake was prepared for him, unless he would turn Turk. Upon which he consented to turn Mahometan, to the great confusion of the Jews. And yet some of the Jews were so vain as to affirm that it was not Sabatai himself, but his shadow, that professed the religion, and was seen in the habit of a Turk: so great was their obstinacy and infidelity; as if it were a thing impossible to convince these deluded and infatuated wretches.

'After all this, several of the Jews continued to use the forms, in their public worship, prescribed by this Mahometan Messias; which obliged the principal Jews of Constantinople to send to the synagogue of Smyrna, to forbid this practice. During these things, the Jews, instead of minding their trade and traffic, filled their letters with news of Sabatai their Messias, and his wonderful works. They reported, that when the grand seignior sent to take him, he caused all the messengers that were sent, to die; and that when other janizaries were sent, they all fell dead by a word of his mouth; and being requested to do it, that he caused them to revive again. They added, that though the prison where Sabatai lay was barred and fastened with strong iron locks, yet he was seen to walk through the streets with a numerous train: that the shackles which were upon his neck and feet did not only fall off, but were turned into gold, with which Sabatai gratified his followers. Upon the fame of these things the Jews of Italy sent legates to Smyrna, to inquire into the truth of these matters. When the legates arrived at Smyrna, they heard of the news that Sabatai was turned Turk, to their very great confusion: but going to visit the brother of Sabatai, he endeavoured to persuade them that Sabatai was still the true Messias; that it was not Sabatai that went about in the habit of a Turk, but his angel or spirit; that his body was taken

into heaven, and should be sent down again when God should think it a fit season. He added that Nathan, his forerunner, who had wrought many miracles, would soon be at Smyrna; that he would reveal hidden things to them, and confirm them. But this Elias was not suffered to come into Smyrna; and though the legates saw him elsewhere, they received no satisfaction from him at all.

'There appeared another impostor in the year 1682. one *Rabbi Mordecai*, a Jew of Germany, a man famous among his countrymen for his learning, and austere kind of life. He was also much cried up for his prophecies, which he uttered, about five years before, at Prague and other places. He was a very sharp reprover of vice, and was for that reason commonly called *Mochiah*, i. e. *the Reprover*. He was so vain as to profess himself to be the Messias; and not only to require the Jews to salute him as such, but upon the matter to adore him. The Italian Jews gave him credit, and so did many of the Jews of Germany also, whither he came out of Italy. We are told that he was mightily caressed in Italy, and received for the Messias; though the Jews of that place, after they saw their error, did not care to own him. A certain Jew, that by order of the Jews called him into Italy, tells us, that upon conversing with him, he found him to be an inchanter, and very silly; that he thereupon warned the Jews not to believe him: upon which the credulous Jews were so enraged that they treated their monitor very maliciously, and dismissed him from the place of his abode. They withal threatened him very severely, if he durst speak evil any more of their Messias: that this Jew continuing to disparage this impostor, the Italian Jews were so enraged that they endeavoured to cast him out of the place where he was settled, and declared that whosoever should do him mischief, or bear false witness against this person, who defamed their Messias, should be esteemed guiltless.' Kidder.

Joannes a Lent wrote a 'Schediasma de Judæorum Pseudo-Messiis.' Bishop Kidder treated the same subject in his 'Demonstration of the Messias,' and made use of this 'Schediasma;' and I have borrowed from them both. Kidder's book contains much useful erudition delivered in a slovenly and plebeian style, as may be seen in this spe-

cimen. De La Croix, in his 'Relation of the Othoman Empire,' hath also given us an ample account, and many curious and entertaining particularities of *Sabatai Sevi*, who, when he had apostatized, preached at Constantinople, and drew over many Jews to profess Mohammedism. At last he was committed to prison for the rest of his days, and died A. D. 1679. La Croix saw him, and heard him preach.

With *Rabbi Mordecai* endeth the history of the false Messiahs, and the Jews (I think) have had none since. It may seem strange that they should have rejected Christ, who gave them so many proofs of his mission, and yet should follow every impostor who pretended to be the Messias, without offering any sufficient or even plausible evidence of it. The reason is plain: Our Saviour, by not setting up a temporal kingdom, dashed all their worldly views at once; but the other claimers of the title of Messiah began with promises of delivering them from their enemies, and restoring to them their country and their lost liberties.

Let us now go back to the destruction of Jerusalem by Vespasian and Titus. The Jews, who escaped this slaughter, remained in a poor condition in various parts of the Roman empire [z].

'Iis autem, qui in Judæa remanserant, Titus imperavit ut—nullus sabbatum deinceps servaret; *nullus a menstruata muliere se contineret*, quemadmodum ex tractatu Talmudico *Megilla* clarum est.' J. a Lent.

Was ever any thing so absurd? and who but a *Talmudist*, or a *Cabbalist*, could take it into his silly head to conceive that Titus would have published such a decree, to plague the poor Jews?

'—— atque equidem,
Tum etiam, si nolit, cogam ut cum illa una cubet.'

Terent. Adelph. v. 3.

[z] Concerning the state of the Jews from the destruction of Jerusalem to the end of the fifth century, their ecclesiastical government, their colleges, their talmud, or deuteroses, their rabbins, doctors, patriarchs, and apostles, there are some curious remarks in Pezron, 'Defense de l'Antiquité des Tems.'

This good-natured emperor was so far from persecuting, that he pitied and protected them; and when he was at Antioch, and the people there earnestly importuned him to banish the Jews from that city, he checked them, and said, Where would you have these unhappy men go? they have now no country and city of their own to receive them. Josephus, B. J. vii. 5.

Domitian succeeded Titus, and was a cruel and worthless prince, who oppressed all his subjects, but particularly the Jews. He imposed heavy tributes upon them, which they were ill able to pay, and exacted them with great rigour and insolence.

After this, in the time of Trajan, the Jews grew weary of their dependency, and of the Roman yoke, and raised a rebellion in Libya, Ægypt, Cyprus, and Mesopotamia; they exercised all sorts of iniquities and cruelties, and slew an innumerable multitude of people. If they had not been infatuated, they would never have chosen such a time to rebel, when the Romans had one of the greatest, bravest, and wisest emperors that ever reigned, who understood war perfectly, and who loved it too much; for, with many accomplishments, he had that defect. This revolt brought on a war between the Jews and Romans: battles were fought, and the Jews were beaten, and severely punished.

After Trajan, Adrian was emperor, who also was a great and powerful prince, and who took care to maintain numerous and disciplined forces. Under him the Jews rebelled again in Palæstine, headed by one *Barcochab*, an impostor and a false prophet, who was a robber and a murderer, and ravaged the country, and did incredible mischief.

Encouraged by this villain, the Jews drew together and attempted to settle at Jerusalem, whereby they provoked Adrian to send an army against them, which took Jerusalem, and destroyed it down to the ground a second time, and slew all the Jews that were to be found, not sparing even the infants. If we may believe the Jewish writers, their nation at that time suffered calamities not less severe nor less extensive than those under Vespasian. It is said that there died by sword, famine, sickness, and fire, five hundred-and-eighty thousand persons. The surviving Jews

were sold in the markets, like beasts, to any who would purchase them, for a small price.

When this war was thus ended, Adrian forbad all the Jews, on pain of death, to set foot in Jerusalem. It is said by some antient writers, that once a year they purchased leave to approach their old city, and there to fast and weep over its ruins.

Adrian then rebuilt a city near the place where Jerusalem stood, gave it a new name, peopled it with Pagans, and made it a Roman colony.

It appears from some passages in history that not long after this, under Antoninus Pius, the Jews rose and rebelled again, and were repressed. It is astonishing how after so many calamities they should have had the resolution and the strength to appear in arms.

Under his successor Marcus Aurelius, one of the best emperors that ever lived, they were so foolish and infatuated as to join themselves to a base worthless rebel, who rose up against so good a master: but the emperor forgave them, and showed them more mercy than they deserved.

Under Severus they were troublesome, and did something that provoked him to make war against them, in which he had the advantage. This emperor, who was of a cruel disposition, published a rigid edict against them, and threatened to punish any of his subjects who should embrace their religion.

The conversion of Constantine produced a great revolution, by which Christianity became the established religion. And now the Jews were subject to Christian as they had been before to Pagan emperors; but this revolution brought with it no advantage to them: it was rather a detriment.

'The Jews were not much happier under Christian emperors than they had been under the reign of idolaters. Their condition varied according to the temper of their rulers. Christians had suffered so much from persecution, that they could not instantly change their maxims and their notions about it. Constantine contented himself with making some laws which laid some restraint on the liberty of the Jews, though they were the objects of his hatred: but the Christians insensibly followed the bent of corrupted

nature, which inclines us to torment and punish those who contradict us in matters of religion. Even the councils, which ought to have been more equitable, gave into this spirit, and became the incendiaries which inflamed the princes against the poor remains of this unhappy nation. We often make our boasts of the prevailing influence of humanity, and imagine that the dictates of nature suffice to teach us compassion for our fellow-creatures. But pride is another principle in us, which is more prevalent than compassion; and pride excites our indignation when we see a body of persons who think differently from us, and who assume the liberty to dispute against those truths of which we judge ourselves to be in possession. Humanity speaks first, and pleads for gentleness and forbearance; but pride bids her be silent, and hardens the heart against these softer impressions. Thus persecutions arise in every religion; whilst the teachers are inclined to look upon all opposition made to the doctrines of which they are the expounders and the defenders, as so many personal attacks upon themselves. Hence councils often authorise and begin those oppressions, which princes afterwards carry to the utmost rage and excess.' Basnage, Hist. des Juifs, vi. 14.

The council of Toledo, A. D. 633. made a cruel decree, that all the children of Jews should be taken away from their parents and put into monasteries, or into the hands of religious persons, to be instructed in Christianity. Fleury, H. E. viii. 367.

'The first event to be found in the Life of Constantine, relating to the Jews, is reported by Zonaras. This historian informs us that they had a conference at Rome with Helena (the mother of Constantine), who was not yet converted. They represented to this princess, that, if her son had done well in abolishing Paganism and its idols, he was not much nearer to salvation, since, instead of worshipping the heroes of Pagan antiquity, he adored a man who had been crucified in later times. Helena, who was religious, and disquieted on account of her son, obliged the Jewish doctors to hold a conference with pope Silvester, who soon triumphed over these enemies of Christianity. But whilst they were disputing, a magician called *Zambres*,

whom the rabbins had brought with them, caused an ox to fall down dead at the foot of Silvester. The miracle disconcerted not the prelate, for he raised the ox to life; and then all the persons present, acknowledging in the pope a power superior to that of the magician, received baptism, and Helena also desired to be instructed in the faith. This is the story of a monk: but as there are in the world persons of all sorts, and understandings of all sizes, if any should be found credulous enough to digest this conference, this miracle, and the sudden conversion that followed it, he may have recourse to the authority of an Arabian historian, who assures that twelve thousand Jews and Pagans, without counting women and children, received baptism at Rome under the reign of Constantine. Abulpharagius indeed speaks not of the miracle; but by tacking together the account of the Arab, and that of the Greek monk, the latter event may be looked upon as the consequence of the former, and the conversion of so great a number as a proof and an effect of the resurrection of the ox.' Basnage, Hist. des Juifs, vi. 14. § 2.

It is to be supposed that the magician whispered in the ear of the ox the *ineffable name*, which struck him dead; and it is a wonder that Zonaras did not think of it. Perhaps the name of this magician should be not *Zambres*, but *Jambres*, who must have been an old man indeed, if he were the same that *contended with Moses*. See the Remarks of S. Basnage on this fable. Ann. ii. 660.

The zeal which Constantine had for Christianity set him against the Jews, as they were enemies to the Gospel. He subjected to punishment those who should become proselytes to Judaism, and he ruled the Jews with a strict and heavy hand.

He ordered churches to be built, where they were necessary, and where they were not, as in those towns and villages which were inhabited almost only by Jews; which must have been a great mortification to that people.

He made a law, as an antient author tells us, which condemned those who should speak evil of Christ to lose half their estate.

In his time, as some relate, the Jews endeavoured, not by arms and violence, but in a silent and quiet way, to

steal a settlement at Jerusalem, and to build themselves a temple, or some little edifice, which they would have called a temple: of which Constantine being apprised, he is said to have cut off the ears of those who had been the forwardest in this attempt, and to have ordered them to be sent to their several abodes with this mark of his displeasure.

'It is affirmed that Constantine persecuted the Jews; and Chrysostom assures us that they assembled to rebuild Jerusalem, and that this prince, offended at their rashness and impudence, cut off their ears, and dispersed them as fugitive slaves through all the provinces of the empire. Eutychius adds, that Constantine obliged them all to be baptized, and to eat pork at Easter. Persecution can hardly be carried further than this: but I doubt whether the facts be true. St. Chrysostom hath great authority in the church, yet it is not always safe to trust him as an historian; and indeed the Jews themselves say, and Abulpharagius confirms it, that it was the emperor Adrian who cut off their ears, and sold them as slaves in the markets. Besides, Jerusalem was rebuilt in the reign of Constantine, its bishop had assisted at the Nicene Council; and the emperor adorned it with such magnificent structures, that Eusebius told him, in a *profane manner*[a], that he had built the New Jerusalem foretold by the prophets. How then could the Jews mutiny and assemble there to do what was already done? Lastly, in the Theodosian Code, although there be many laws, under the name of Constantine, against the Jews, there is not one which orders them to have their ears cut off, to be baptized, and to eat swine's flesh.

'But this prince published several edicts, which show the condition and the unquiet temper of the Jews in his time. The first is one of the most important. It was made, if I mistake not, on account of Joseph, who had abandoned the synagogue, to embrace Christianity. The Jews, vexed at his conversion, persecuted him even in his own house; and having found him reading the Gospel, they took the book from him, loaded him with insults and

[a] A man must be in a quarrelsome humour to treat Eusebius so roughly for such a trifle.

blows, and dragged him to the synagogue, where they scourged him cruelly. Not content with these outrages, they flung him into the river Cydnus, whose current carrying him out of their sight, they had the joy to think that he was drowned: but God preserved his life. He received baptism, and made himself known at court, and obtained leave from the emperor to build churches in divers places where there never had been any before. The Jews were then settled at Diocæsarea, Tiberias, Nazareth, and Capernaum, and had so engrossed those cities that they would suffer no strangers there, not even the Samaritans. Joseph undertook to introduce Christianity into these cities, and began to build churches in them. At Tiberias he met with an opposition which procured him the favour of a miraculous assistance. There was in that town a large edifice, which had been intended for a temple to Adrian: as it had not been finished, there was a design to use it for a bagnio. Joseph was resolved to make it a church; and wanting lime, he built some furnaces without the city for that purpose. The Jews, irritated at his attempt, had recourse, as Epiphanius relates it, to magic arts; and they were so successful, that the fire could not be kindled, nor any lime be made. Joseph, vexed at such an unforeseen incident, went out from the city, followed by a great number of people, whose curiosity led them to see what he would do. When he came to the place, he made the sign of the cross, and, invoking the name of Jesus over some water which he had brought in a large vessel, endued it with a power to dissipate the inchantment, and to kindle the fire: and flinging some of it into each of the furnaces, the wood instantly took fire, and the flames appeared. This miracle converted a great number of the Jews; but the rest remained hardened, and ceased not to oppose the building of the temple, so that only a part of it was finished, in which a small church was erected.

'Epiphanius[b] seems to have been thoroughly persuaded of the truth of this miracle. As for us, we shall only

[b] See the whole history of Joseph in Tillemont, H. E. vii. 290. It is a curious legend, and it rests upon the authority of Epiphanius.

observe that the Jews were still powerful under Constantine, since they possessed four towns, one of which was Nazareth, where Christ had been brought up. Their numbers made them insolent; for they assaulted those who went over to Christianity, and publicly opposed the execution of the imperial orders for the building of churches.

'This was what obliged Constantine to publish the edict of which we have been speaking. He upbraids them, "that when any person had a mind to quit their religion, they stoned him or cast him in the fire:" and he condemns them and their accomplices to the same punishment. We see here the traces of those transports of zeal, by which they thought themselves authorized to kill those whom they surprised in any flagrant crime. These were pretended to be precepts of the oral law, and it was alleged that Phineas had executed the verbal orders of Moses. Another example also was produced from the Maccabees, when Mattathias slew the Jew who was performing Pagan rites. Their doctors authorized such practices, and Philo affirms that God had established them. The Essenes, devout and austere, ordered that if any one should blaspheme against Moses, he should be slain. This sect had not the power of life and death, and therefore must have punished such offenders by an act of zeal. In spite of the horrible disorders and massacres perpetrated by the zealots at Jerusalem, the nation still preserved the dangerous maxim, and the Misnah teaches, that if any one renounce fundamentals, he must be slain: by which rule they stoned, burned, and flung into rivers those who apostatized, under the reign of Constantine. So that he was obliged to repress this violence; and as they obeyed not his first law, he was forced to publish a second.

'He also forbad Christians to go over to Judaism, under penalties to be inflicted at the pleasure of the magistrate. What was most to be feared was, that slaves might be seduced by their masters; he therefore suffered not the Jews to circumcise their servants, and ordered all those to be set at liberty who had been so used, or who were willing to embrace Christianity. Eusebius says that it was not permitted to the Jews to purchase or to keep

Christian slaves [c], and gives this reason for it, that it was not fit that they who had been redeemed by the blood of Jesus Christ should be in bondage to the murderers of the prophets and of the Son of God.

'Lastly, Constantine ordered that the Jews might be made *Decurions*, since it was reasonable that they should bear part of the burthen of public offices: but he exempted their patriarchs and priests, and those who had considerable employments in the synagogues, as men who had not leisure to serve in civil offices; and indeed it was not an honour but a burthen to serve as a *Decurion*, and every one endeavoured to shun it by taking other employments in the army and in the state, or by obtaining an exemption from the emperor. Constantine and his sons granted them to so many persons, that in the time of Julian none were left to serve the public in these posts. He was therefore obliged to recall those privileges, without discrimination, which caused great clamours against him and his memory, whilst others commended his conduct. Such was the condition of the Jews under the first Christian prince.' Basnage, Hist. des Juifs, vi. 14.

Under Constantius, the violent dissensions amongst the Christians might have been profitable to the Jews, if they could have been quiet, and had behaved themselves well: for, when the Christians had divided and subdivided themselves into sects, they hated, calumniated, and oppressed each other more than they did the infidels; and in the fourth and fifth centuries it was safer to be a Jew [d] or a

[c] Theodosius forbad the Jews to keep Christian slaves, A. D. 384. Cod. Th. l. iii. tit. i. p. 246.

[d] Honorius and Theodosius II. made a law, that the Jews should not be compelled to violate their Sabbaths, and their other holy days, upon any pretence, A. D. 409. 'Die Sabbati, ac reliquis, sub tempore quo Judæi cultus sui reverentiam servant, neminem aut facere aliquid, aut ulla ex parte conveniri debere præcipimus: cum fiscalibus commodis, et litigiis privatorum, constat reliquos dies posse sufficere,' &c. Cod. Th. l. ii. tit. viii. p. 125. Thus were the Jews indulged, whilst no pity and favour was showed to those Christians who were called Heretics.

Arcadius and Honorius, in their law, 'De Judæorum foro,' A. D. 398. had ordered, that in civil things the Jews should be subject to the

Pagan, than to be a Heretic, or a Schismatic, or a Christian of this or that denomination; and the obscurer the controverted points were, the greater was the contention, as it usually happens.

But the Jews, who could never be at rest, took arms in Palæstine, in the time of Constantius, and slew the soldiers who were quartered there, and many of the inhabitants, and ravaged the country: upon which Gallus Cæsar, the emperor's cousin, attacked them; and being of a cruel disposition, he burnt their cities, and slew all that he could find, without sparing even the women and the children.

Julian, in spite to the Christians, used the Jews kindly, and promised them great things, and had a mind to settle them again at Jerusalem, to rebuild their temple, and to enable them to observe their ceremonial as well as their moral law, which would have been an insult upon Christ and Christianity. He was resolved, says Marcellinus, to spare no pains or expense, and to restore the temple to its former splendor, and he gave orders to the governor of the province to set about it; which was instantly done: but when the work was begun, terrible balls of fire broke out from the foundations, and made the place inaccessible; and, upon many repeated endeavours, slew the workmen; so that, the fire never ceasing to rage whilst any attempt was made to go on with the work, the undertaking was laid aside. 'Ambitiosum quondam apud Hierosolymam templum, quod post multa et interneciva certamina, obsidente Vespasiano posteaque Tito, ægre est expugnatum, instaurare sumtibus cogitabat immodicis: negotiumque maturandum Alypio dederat Antiochensi, qui olim Britannias curaverat pro præfectis. Cum itaque rei idem fortiter in-

civil laws; but in religious things, to their own laws and decisions. Cod. Th. l. ii. tit. i. p. 87.

Valentinian I. had also protected the Jews, and did not permit their synagogues to be profaned, A. D. 368. Cod. Th. l. vii. tit. viii. p. 344. et Gothofred. This illustrious prince had his faults, but he had his virtues likewise. He was a true and á steady friend to toleration, and would not suffer his subjects to be persecuted for their religious opinions: he was also a friend to letters and to learned men. For these two good qualities he deserves to be mentioned with respect; and it is much to be wished that all princes would imitate his example.

staret Alypius, juvaretque provinciæ rector, metuendi globi flammarum, prope fundamenta crebris assultibus erumpentes, fecere locum, exustis aliquoties operantibus, inaccessum: hocque modo, elemento destinatius repellente, cessavit inceptum.' xxxiii. 1.

The same thing is related by many Christian writers, as by Gregory Nazianzen, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Rufinus, Socrates, Sozomen, Philostorgius, Theodoret, &c.; some of whom lived at the time. They say nothing that contradicts the Pagan historian, but they mention an earthquake, and add some circumstances not recorded by him, in which perhaps there may be exaggeration and embellishment. There is not one of these Christian authors who has not impaired his credit by the relation of miracles manifestly false; but still their testimony as to the principal fact is of weight, and is confirmed by Marcellinus, by Jewish writers, and perhaps by some passages in Julian's Epistles; and by this circumstance above all, that they appeal to a thing which any one might go and see with his own eyes, to the interrupted work at Jerusalem, and to the foundations of the temple, which had been digged up by the Jews, to clear the ground for the intended edifice; so that, all things considered, the story is as well attested as one can reasonably expect.

But, when a man hath no mind to believe a thing, he seldom wants excuses. The Jews who lived at that time, and would not allow this to be a miracle in favour of Christianity, ascribed it perhaps to God's displeasure against Julian, a bigoted idolater, who deserved not the honour of rebuilding his temple, or to their own transgressions, which made them unworthy of being at that time restored; for men will acknowledge their own faults, when they can reap any advantage from the concession. The Pagans might give the honour of it to their deities, who hated the Jewish superstition and impiety; they might say that Providence interposed, just as it did when the Cnidians endeavoured to make an island of their peninsula [e]. And perhaps

[e] Nam quum initium ex Bybassia peninsula sumat, et præter exiguum quid Cnidia omnis sit circumflua: (eam enim partem, quæ Boream spectat, Ceramicus coercet sinus, australem vero mare, in quo est

both Jews and Pagans ascribed it to natural causes; for there have been eruptions of subterraneous fires in various times and places, and such eruptions have perhaps sometimes accompanied earthquakes, though not so often as some have imagined. Tacitus mentions a remarkable instance of fire issuing from the earth: 'Sed civitas Juhonum, socia nobis, malo improviso afflicta est: nam ignes terra editi, villas, arva, vicos passim corripiebant, ferebanturque in ipsa conditæ nuper coloniæ mœnia; neque extingui poterant, non si imbres caderent, non si fluvialibus aquis, aut quo alio humore niterentur: donec inopia remedii, et ira cladis, agrestes quidam eminus saxa jacere, dein residentibus flammis propius suggressi, ictu fustium, aliisque verberibus, ut feras absterrebant: postremo tegmina corpori direpta injiciunt, quanto magis profana et usu polluta, tanto magis oppressura ignes.' Ann. xiii. 57.

This relation given by Tacitus hath been thought extravagant and romantic by a late writer. Let us consider whether it be not supported by an authentic account of a fountain in Poland:

'In Poloniæ minoris Palatinatu Cracoviensi mons reperitur *Admirabilis* appellatus, &c.—in cujus plagæ meridionalis medio scaturigo quædam aquæ limpidissimæ cum strepitu ac vibratione notabili exsurgit, cujus quidem ebullitio seu turgescentia cum lunæ augmento intenditur, cum decremento remittit.—Nullo intra natales hiemis congelascit frigore, imo, quod mirabile, a face propius admota instar subtilissimi spiritus vini exardescit, ut flamma super aquæ superficiem instar bullarum agitetur et subsultet, ideo-

Syme ac Rhodus) istud igitur exiguum, circiter quinque stadiorum, Cnidii fodiebant, interea dum Harpagus Ioniam everteret, volentes suam regionem in insulæ formam redigere. Intus vero universa illis erat: nam Cnidia regio qua parte in continentem finitur, illic isthmus est, quem fodiebant. Et sane multa manu operantibus Cnidiis, amplius humano et divinius videbantur vulnerari operarii, quam solet in talibus fieri, cum alias corporis partes, tum præcipue oculos incisâ et vulneratâ petrâ: Delphos miserunt consultores oraculi, qui sciscitarentur quidnam esset quod tantopere adversaretur. Pythia, ut ipsi referunt Cnidii, senario versu respondit talia;

'Nec aggerate, nec vel isthmum fodite:
Nam si placuisset, insulam dederat Deus.'

Herodotus.

que fons hic ignis fatuus audiat. Atque hic quidem ignis sponte sua nunquam extinguitur, nisi scopis percutiatur; quemadmodum ante annos circiter triginta quinque, cum accolæ accensum restinguere negligerent, per cataractas subterraneas sensim progrediendo radices arborum et cum his totam vicinam silvam in cineres redegit, per tres fere annos durans, antequam perfecte suffocari posset: a quo tempore publicæ etiam excubiæ constitutæ sunt, quæ frivolas ejusmodi accensiones impediant. Dum autem aliquantulum flagrat hæc aqua, multum sui impetus deponit, intra quatuordecim dies vix recuperandi. De cætero quamvis ligna admota brevi comburat hæc flamma, adeo tamen subtilis est, ut aquam non calefaciat sed hausta hæc frigida percipiatur; imo nec ipsa extra suam scaturiginem exardescit, utut in vasis exactissime clausis asservetur. Inflammabilitatem hujus fontis cunctis superioribus seculis ignotam fulmen manifestavit, quod casu eum feriens eundem accendit. Hinc lignatores ex silva vicina accurrentes, virgultis ex cæsis arboribus aquæ summitatem verberando ignem restinxerunt, a quo tempore aliquoties postmodum, experimenti causa, mediante face ardente illa denuo accensa, et virgultorum succussione quoque extincta fuit. Unde factum ut provinciæ illius incolæ cæca credulitate sibi persuaserint, fulmen seu tonitru a prima illa accensione in profundo fontis remansisse, quod dum egredi conetur, aquam adeo exagitet, et flammam hanc ad ejus superficiem erumpere faciat.'—See Act. Erud. 1684. p. 326.

We have an account of a tract of land about two miles long, near the Caspian Sea, which is inflammable, and which always burns, without casting out either smoke or flames, or consuming any thing. Phil. Transact. for the year 1748. N° 487, 488.

In the year 1647. at Santorini, an island in the Archipelago, subject to earthquakes, 'silvæ subterraneo igne conflagrantes pastoribus et armentis non leve damnum intulerunt.' Act. Erud. 1688. p. 517.

Ammianus Marcellinus, after describing the earthquake by which Nicomedia was overturned, adds, 'Superesse potuit ædium sacrarum et privatarum, hominumque pars major, ni palantes abrupte flammarum ardores per quadraginta dies et noctes quicquid consumi poterat exussissent.'

xvii. 7. But these Nicomedian fires were the fires of kitchens, baths, forges, &c. which burnt the timber and other combustible materials of the fallen houses, as Sozomen expressly informs us, iv. 16.

In the fifth century the city of Antioch was destroyed by an earthquake and a fire. 'Succussio et terræ motus urbi supervenientes, pæne universam prostraverunt. Posthæc secutus est ignis—quæcumque enim loca a succussione et terræ motu subversa non fuerant, ignis depascens in cinerem ac favillas redegit.' Evagrius, iv. 5. This also seems to have been no subterraneous eruption, but like the fire at Nicomedia. Sixty-one years after, there was another earthquake at Antioch, described by Evagrius, who was then in the city, in which sixty thousand persons perished: but, by the mercy of God, says Evagrius, no fire broke out. 'Nullum exortum est incendium, quamvis ingens ignis copia passim in urbe esset, partim ex focis, partim ex publicis et privatis lucernis, ex culinis item et fornacibus ac balneis, aliisque innumeris locis.' vi. 8.

When twelve cities in Asia fell by an earthquake, fire was seen to burst out. 'Effulsisse inter ruinam ignes memorant.' Tacitus Ann. ii. 47.

Josephus mentions a violent earthquake in Judæa: Ἐν τούτῳ καὶ τῆς ἐπ' Ἀκτίῳ μάχης συνεσταμένης Καίσαρι πρὸς Ἀντώνιον—σεισθεῖσα ἡ γῆ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ὡς οὐκ ἄλλοτ' ἐδόκει, τῶν ἐν τῇ χώρα κτηνῶν πολλὴν φθορὰν ἐποίησεν, ἐφθάρησαν δὲ καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὑπὸ ταῖς πεπτωκυίαις οἰκείαις περὶ μυρίους. 'Interea per tempus pugnæ Actiacæ, quæ Cæsari cum Antonio fuit,—concussa Judææ terra, quantum nunquam antea videbatur, magnam pecorum stragem fecit per totam regionem, oppressaque sunt hominum etiam circiter decem millia ruinâ domorum.' Ant. xv. 5.

There had probably been other earthquakes in Palæstine, in divers times. That in the reign of Uzziah is mentioned as very remarkable by Zachariah and by Amos.

But though it should be supposed and allowed that the eruption was not without natural causes, and that the seeds of it lay hid in the bowels of the earth; yet as this most uncommon fire broke out at the very instant when the Jews and Pagans were attempting to rebuild the temple, and was renewed, as the historian says, upon their renewed

attempt to go on, and ceased when they gave over, these circumstances seemed to be plain marks of a providential interposition.

Another, and a most memorable circumstance, which distinguished it from the pretended miracles of those days, is, that it was not wrought to serve a party, and either to favour or to confute Athanasians, Arians, Semiarians, Sabellians, Novatians, Manichæans, Monks, Anti-monks, Relique-mongers, Relique-haters, Fasters, Eaters, Friends or Foes to matrimony, &c. No sect could claim any countenance or honour from it, but it was performed by Providence for the credit of Christianity, and to serve the common cause against Judaism and Paganism.

It hath been said that Christ, who foretold the destruction of the temple, yet hath not affirmed that it should be rebuilt no more, or hath not clearly declared how long it should lie in ruins; and that if the Jews had rebuilt their temple under Julian, yet they would not have had time to make use of it, because his Christian successor would have pulled it down, or converted it into a church; and that therefore there was no occasion for a miracle to prevent Julian's design.

But where is the force or the reasonableness of this argument? If it was not fit that the Jews should have a temple, it might surely be as proper that God himself should interpose, as that he should leave it to the Christians; and it was more to the confusion of Judaism, and to the honour of Christianity, which certainly was concerned in the affair.

The Jews, according to the writers of the New Testament, suffered the evils which they underwent, for their disobedience, and their rebellion against Christ; and as the national disobedience then continued, it was fit that the national punishment should continue also. The ceremonial law had been abolished by the gospel, and therefore it was fit that the Jews should not be put in a capacity to observe it, though they were ever so willing. Thus they were under a curse, as the antient Christian writers often observe, because they could not perform the legal expiations and atonements. The Jews might have replied, that God accepted the will for the deed, that a contrite

heart would serve instead of sacrifices, that no man is bound to impossibilities, and that under the Babylonian captivity they ceased not to be God's people, though they had neither temple nor sacrifice. But the long cessation of the ceremonial law for no less than three hundred years, brought in a prescription against it, and showed that it was antiquated, and that the new and second covenant had taken place of the first. The longer the Jewish dispersion and the desolation of Jerusalem continued, the more force the Christian argument gathered. In the time of Julian it pressed hard upon them, but much harder when that nation had lost all distinction of tribes, and could find no priests and Levites to officiate, though their temple had been rebuilt. The argument now stands thus: Your forefathers, when by idolatry, sorcery, shedding of innocent blood, and all sorts of defilements, they had provoked God beyond measure, were carried captives to Babylon; but after seventy years they returned and rebuilt their temple. Since that time you have been no more guilty of idolatry, and yet you are rejected of God these seventeen hundred years. What crime have you committed against him worse than idolatry, or high treason, for which you are thus severely punished beyond all former example of God's dealing with you? It must be for the rejection of the Messias. Orobius the Jew, in his dispute with Limborch, was greatly distressed by this argument, and knew not how to answer it.

The subject which I am now treating hath been very well discussed by Mr. Warburton, to whose book I refer the reader for further satisfaction; and to his arguments and observations I shall only here add a few remarks, to confirm those of my friend.

First: the fire which came out from the foundations of the temple, and destroyed the workmen, and dispersed the Jews, was to the Jews a particular mark of God's displeasure and interposition, because it was the way in which God had been constantly used to manifest himself. God, considered as the punisher of sinners, is said to be a consuming fire; when he appeared, his glory was as a devouring fire; when he is represented in the Psalms as taking vengeance, fire is said to have proceeded from him,

and smoke, and burning coals, and lightnings; fire is an emblem of his wrath and vindictive justice; by fire he often punished the ungodly, as the inhabitants of Sodom, and the rebellious Jews; by fire the world is to be consumed, and the future punishment of evil angels and evil men is represented under the words *everlasting fire*. Hence in the holy Scriptures fire heaped upon the head denotes vengeance descending from above, that is, divine vengeance; and as the natural effect of heaping fire upon a man's head is destruction, in the figurative sense it must mean punishment. So in the Psalms, 'Let burning coals fall upon them;' so in Esdras, 'Let not the sinner say he hath not sinned, for God shall heap coals of fire upon his head who saith before the Lord God and his glory, he hath not sinned;' so Solomon in the Proverbs, 'If thine enemy be hungry, give him bread to eat, if he be thirsty, give him water to drink, for thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head, and the Lord shall reward thee;' which words of Solomon St. Paul hath made use of in his Epistle[e] to the Romans.

When God expelled Adam from Paradise, he placed a flaming sword, which turned every way, to keep him out.

When he made a covenant with Abraham, a smoking furnace and a burning lamp passed between the divided sacrifice.

When he appeared to Moses, it was in a flame of fire out of the midst of the bush.

He guided the Israelites by a pillar of fire.

When he descended upon mount Sinai, it was in a fire, a devouring fire, and an earthquake; and the face of Moses shone after he had seen the glory of God.

When the tabernacle was erected, the glory of the Lord filled it, and appeared as a fire by night.

When Aaron and his sons were consecrated, there came a fire from before the Lord, and consumed the burnt offering: and when Nadab and Abihu made an offering in an illegal manner, there went out a fire from the Lord, and slew them.

[e] Where see Grotius and Whitby. See also Jeremiah, v. 14. and Revel. xi. 5. and Le Clerc, Bibl. Anc. et Mod. i. p. 373.

When the people murmured at Taberah, the fire of the Lord burnt among them and consumed them.

When two hundred and fifty men, joining themselves to Corah, offered incense, there came out a fire from the Lord and consumed them.

The angel of God consumed Gideon's sacrifice with fire.

The Philistines in the days of Samuel were discomfited by thunder and lightning; and by thunder and lightning God showed his approbation of Samuel, and his displeasure against the Israelites.

When Solomon dedicated the temple, the fire fell from heaven and consumed the burnt-offering, and the glory of the Lord filled the house.

Elijah brought down fire from heaven to consume his sacrifice, and twice afterwards, to destroy two captains with their companies, who were sent to apprehend him. A fire went before God when he manifested himself to this great prophet, who was afterwards taken up into heaven in a chariot of fire.

It was reported amongst the Jews that Herod, a little before the birth of Christ, broke open the sepulchre of David, to plunder it, and that two of his guards were struck dead with a fire which burst out upon them. So says Josephus, who gives it as a common rumour[f], ὡς ἐλέγετο. Ant. xvi. 7.

When James and John wanted leave to punish the Samaritans for their rudeness, they asked Christ to permit them to call down fire from heaven: and when the Holy Ghost descended at Pentecost, it was in the appearance of fire.

Thus God used to show his presence by fire, either to declare his favour or his anger. When he was propitious, he consumed the sacrifice, and when he was offended he consumed the sinner: and therefore the fiery eruption at Jerusalem upon the attempt to rebuild the temple, seemed to be

[f] It might be as true as the story related by Evagrius. 'Barsanuph, the monk, in the time of Justinian, wrought innumerable miracles; and is firmly believed to be still living, shut up in his cell, although more than fifty years are passed since any man hath seen him, or he hath received any nourishment. Eustochius, bishop of Jerusalem, would not believe this; and ordered the cell to be opened in which the man of God had shut himself up, whereupon a fire burst out, and slew almost all those who were present.' H. E. iv. 33.

a signal mark of divine displeasure. Unbelievers will reject all these examples as fabulous, and their system, though unreasonable, is so far consistent with itself: but why should a man, who believes the Scriptures, think it inconceivable that there should have been a providential interposition in this affair?

I observe, secondly, that if Julian had succeeded in his attempt to rebuild the temple, and had lived some years longer, the Jews would have been enabled to restore the temple-service and the ceremonial law. Three hundred years which were elapsed from the destruction of Jerusalem, had not perhaps so far confounded all distinction of families as to deprive them of a priesthood: but now, if they had Judæa in their possession, and a temple there, they could not re-establish the ceremonial law, having lost long ago all genealogies and all distinction of tribes. Some of the best Jewish doctors own as much, when they say that part of the office of the Messias shall be to sort their families, restore their genealogies, and set aside strangers; and that he shall purge and purify the sons of Levi, saying, This is a priest, and this is a Levite. See Chandler's Def. of Christ. p. 47. 'Il est étonnant qu'on ose soutenir qu'on a conservé la distinction des tribus, et des familles. Maimonides a eu la bonne foi d'avouër qu'elles étoient tellement confonduës depuis le tems de Sennacherib, qu'on ne pouvoit plus les demêler.—*Hinc familiæ inter nos confusæ sunt, ita ut dignosci nequeant inter se, nec e locis ipsarum cognosci.*' Basnage Hist. des Juifs, t. iv. p. 1032.

The Jews, since the destruction of Jerusalem, have lived under Pagan, Christian, and Mahometan princes, and from time to time have been oppressed by them all, even when they did nothing to deserve it, but behaved themselves in the most obliging, quiet, and submissive manner.

As they were almost every where upon a kind of connivance, and upon the foot of strangers and sojourners, and excluded from places of power, honour, and profit, and from many ways of getting their bread, they applied themselves to commerce, and to lend money upon interest; and several of them in former days grew both rich and infamous by extortions. I say not this to reproach them in particular; for Christians have done and do the same. But what they thus got, perhaps by disingenuous dealing

and dishonest tricks, the princes often took away from them with the utmost iniquity and insolence; and so they were drudges and tools to arbitrary power, and spunges to be squeezed by merciless and avaricious tyrants. Thus, here in England, king John cast them into prison, not for any crime that he had to lay to their charge, but to make them deliver up their effects to him: there they were put to the torture, had their teeth pulled out, and were mangled and maimed to redeem themselves[g] from destruction.

A thousand calumnies[h] have been spread concerning them, as that they were magicians, that they profaned the host, and that they crucified Christian children; and as many lying miracles were reported to confirm those accusations, and then popular emotions and massacres always ensued.

For one story of this kind that was true, a multitude of false ones were related. Socrates tells us that in the fifth century, in the time of Honorius, some Jews in the neighbourhood of Antioch, who were drunk, took a Christian boy, tied him to a cross, derided and reviled him, and growing frantic gave him so many blows that he died. Upon which the governor of the province punished them severely. vii. 16.

Some time after this a Jew went to several bishops, pretending to embrace Christianity, and was baptized many times, and got money from the Christians. At last, he went with the same story to Paul the bishop of the Novatians, and desired baptism. The bishop told him that he must first prepare himself, and learn his Christian rudiments, and read, and pray, and fast for several days; which went much against the man's stomach. So he begged the time might be shortened, pretending zeal and impatience. But when he came to the baptismal font, behold, a miracle! the water suddenly vanished away. Upon a second trial, the same thing happened, though the pipes of the font were carefully stopped. Thus the bishop found him out to be an impostor, and one of the congregation remembered that he had seen him baptized by Atticus. If there be any

[g] ——————'Libertas pauperis hæc est;
Pulsatus rogat, et pugnis concisus adorat,
Ut liceat paucis cum dentibus inde reverti.'

[h] See Manasseh Ben Israel's Vindiciæ Judæorum, in the Phœnix, vol. ii. p. 391.

truth in the story, it is probable that the bishop, who was no fool, and saw that the Jew was a knave, over-reached him, and secretly unstopped a hole to let the water out. See Socrates, vii. 17.

Ambrose, who was made bishop of Milan A. D. 374, very injudiciously defends the burning of a Jewish synagogue by a Christian bishop, and the unlawfulness of rebuilding it; and in his letter[1] to Theodosius on this subject, 'he heaps together thoughts and expressions, which are rather declamations than arguments,' as Du Pin observes very fairly; and hints his dislike of such doctrines, though he dared not to speak out, and 'provoke the hornets.' Vol. ii. p. 285.

'Theodosio nuncius affertur de incenso Valentinianorum templo, nec non de subruta ab episcopo Judæorum synagoga. Rem Ambrosius sic exequitur in sua ad Theodosium epistola:' *monachi, prohibentibus iter Valentinianis, quo Psalmos canentes ex consuetudine, usuque veteri, pergebant ad Maccabæorum martyrium, moti insolentiâ incenderunt fanum eorum.* (De synagoga vero) *relatum est a comite Orientis militarium partium, incensam esse synagogam, idque autore factum episcopo; jussisti vindicari in cæteros, synagogam ab ipso ædificari episcopo.* Ignis fano Valentinianorum à monachis subjicitur. Factum et episcopi et monachorum improbaverat Theodosius, neque immerito, ut nostra fert sententia. Itaque tumultus autores pœnis subjecerat: hoc moleste tulit Ambrosius, qui aculeatâ Theodosium epistolâ pungit: *Quid mandas in absentes judicium? Habes præsentem, habes confitentem reum. Proclamo quod ego synagogam incenderim, certe quod illis mandaverim, ne esset locus, in quo Christus negaretur.* Missa est hæc ad principem epistola: quâ lectâ, cum nondum flecteretur, reversus Mediolanum Ambrosius, in concione adversus Theodosium invehitur, inducto Christo, sic renitentem alloquente: *Ego te triumphare sine labore feci, et tu de me inimicis donas triumphos.* Impetravit tandem, ut quæ mandaverat Imperator revocarentur.

'Zelum quidem Ambrosio non invidemus, prudentiam tamen in eo facto desideramus, cum et monachorum et epi-

[1] Epist. xl.

scopi facinus iniquitate conditum fuerit. Quid publicam evertere tranquillitatem, quid de magistratus autoritate delibare, quid pugnas movere, quid tumultus excitare, si hoc non fuit? Lex est Honorii sapientissima: *Christianis demandamus, ut Judæis ac Paganis quiete degentibus, nihilque tentantibus turbulentum, non audeant manus inferre, religionis autoritate abusi. Nam si contra securos fuerint violenti, vel eorum bona diripuerint, non ea sola quæ abstulerint, sed convicti, in duplum quæ rapuerint restituere compellentur.* Equidem si Valentinianorum fana, si Judæorum synagogæ evertendæ erant, principis edictum requirebatur. Neque privatis licet ædificia, sive Ethnicorum sive Judæorum publica subruere, quorum usus legibus et autoritate imperatorum conceditur. Quod si monachis episcopisve id licitum est, liceat quoque heterodoxorum bona diripere, et privatas domos incendere, in quibus et pietatem negant, et Christo conviciantur. Pace Ambrosii, factum, quod laudat, et vis fuit, et furtum, quo legitimis dominis bona sua eripiebantur, cum perturbatione ordinis omnis, cujus Deus autor est et constitutor. Quam monachis et episcopo impunitatem Ambrosius comparavit, ea maxima fuit illecebra furoris, ut antistites ascetæque omnes licenter flammis cingerent ecclesias hæreticorum, templa ethnicorum, synagogas Judæorum. *Puto dicturum episcopum* (verba sunt Ambrosii) *quod ipse ignes sparserit, turbas compulerit, populos concluserit, ne amittat occasionem martyrii. O beatum mendacium!* Beata hæc mendacia nescit pietas.——

'Hic quidem Baronius lupum auribus tenet, qui laudibus Ambrosii zelum afficit, quem sane improbat Gregorius Magnus, dum contraria Ambrosio statuit,' &c. S. Basnage Ann. iii. 114.

'St. Ambrose expressed the most violent indignation against the emperor upon this occasion. He sent him a letter, which is still extant, and held in veneration as a glorious memorial of his fervent zeal. There are bold men who think that they may say and do any thing under the mask of godliness. The saint tells the prince that he could pray to God no longer for him, if he would not grant him his request. After such an haughty prelude, he asks him with what face he could order a bishop to rebuild the synagogue which he had burned, since the bishop must either be a

prevaricator if he obeyed, or a martyr if he disobeyed him. He takes the fault upon himself, and says that he had ordered the deed; not that this was true, but by way of bravado, and to challenge the emperor to punish him if he dared. He tells him that he would have done the same at Milan, if God had not prevented him by burning the Jewish synagogue himself. He then represents the church of God in tears, the godly bound in chains and fetters, the servants of the Lord condemned to the mines, and the triumphant exultation of the impious Jews, as the sure consequences of the emperor's orders. This sophistry and these rodomontades are so many tokens of gratitude which St. Ambrose was pleased to give to his royal master for having been his friend, his patron, and protector; and with this pride and insolence he repays his favours. Theodosius however complied, as they say, and excused the incendiaries from making restitution.' Basnage, Hist. des Juifs, l. vi. 14. p. 1266. See also some good remarks of Bayle, and of Barbeyrac, Morale des Peres, p. 325 et p. 330, where he takes notice of Symeon Stylites.

Yet this behaviour is what Tillemont, Ceillier, and many others of the church of Rome extol and admire; which makes us also admire no less the wisdom and the judgment of some of our brethren, who send us to learn ecclesiastical history from such writers, without giving us a caution not to trust them too far. They might as well send us to learn morality from Escobar, divinity from Bellarmin, and English history from father Sanders, or any father of that communion.

A. D. 406. A certain Jew had been confined many years to his bed with a palsy at Constantinople. Having tried in vain the aid of all the physicians, and received no benefit from the prayers of the Jews, he resolved to have recourse to the Christians, and to receive baptism. When this was told to Atticus the bishop, he instructed him in the faith, and then ordered him to be brought in his bed to the baptismal font. The Jew, there professing his faith in Christ, was baptized; and as soon as he was taken out of the water, he found himself cured, and his disease returned no more. 'Thus did our Saviour think fit to show forth his power, even in our days, by a miracle which converted

many of the Pagans. But the Jews, though they require signs and wonders, yet have not been moved by these miracles to embrace the Gospel.' Socrates vii. 4.

This is one of the most plausible miracles that are related of those days. There is nothing in it absurd and unreasonable, either in the fact, or the circumstances, or the tendency. Add to this, that Atticus, by whose ministry it is said to have been wrought, was a good prelate, an enemy to violence and persecution, and remarkable for charity and moderation, as Sozomen informs us. But when we consider the genius of the fifth century, and of the historians and writers of those times, it is impossible not to hesitate.

It deserves also some consideration, whether the bathing, and the force of imagination joined together, might not by a natural operation remove a paralytic disorder.

Symeon Stylites began to perch upon his pillar, A. D. 423. In his days the Christians of Antioch, by an insolent act of violence, took away from the Jews their synagogues. The emperor Theodosius junior, when he first heard of it, following the dictates of equity, commanded the Christians to restore to the Jews what was their property. Upon this the *zealous* Symeon, after the example of Ambrose, wrote a reprimanding letter to the emperor, and obliged him to change his sentiments, and to patronize these illegal and unchristian proceedings. 'Tam acriter eum objurgavit, ut imperator, revocata jussione sua, cuncta in gratiam Christianorum fecerit, et præfecto prætorii, qui hæc ipsi suggesserat, potestatem abrogaverit.' Evagrius i. 13.

This gives an ugly blow on the head to Symeon's miracles; since it is hard to suppose that the Divine Providence should commit preternatural powers to the hands of a monk, who was not only an enthusiast, but a patron of persecutors, rioters, robbers, house-breakers, and seditious subjects.

Symeon's pillar was enclosed, afterwards, in a portico, and an annual miracle was wrought there, of which Evagrius himself was an eye-witness. 'Ad lævum igitur columnæ latus, ipse cum reliqua populi multitudine ibi collecta, saltantibus circa columnam rusticis, vidi in fenestra stellam immensæ magnitudinis, per totam fenestram discurrentem, atque radiantem: neque id semel, aut iterum ac tertio, sed

saepius: eandemque crebro evanescentem, atque iterum subito apparentem. Quod quidem non nisi diebus festis, quibus sancti viri memoria quotannis recolitur, fieri solet. Sunt etiam qui dicant (nec fides deroganda est miraculo, tum ob autoritatem eorum qui id affirmant, tum propter alia quæ nos vidimus) se ipsam illius personam vidisse, huc atque illuc volitantem, promissa barba, et capite tiara obvoluto, sicuti consueverat.' i. 14.

This *fire* was an *ignis fatuus*, contrived by the monks to deceive the devout assembly, and such dupes as Evagrius. What tricks would not these monks have played if they had possessed the secret of *electricity*?

A Jewish boy having eaten some of the consecrated bread with his Christian school-fellows, A. D. 536, his father, who was a glass-maker, discovered it, and flung the poor child into his fiery furnace, and locked him in. After three days, the disconsolate mother found him there safe and sound. A fine lady, as the boy declared, clothed in a purple robe, had been with him in the furnace, and had cooled the flames, and given him meat and drink. This lady was the Virgin Mary, who, about the year 408, began to manifest herself, and to work continual miracles. Tidings of these wonders came to the ears of Justinian, who ordered the mother and the boy to be baptized, and admitted amongst the ecclesiastics: but the father, obstinately refusing to receive Christianity, was, by command of the emperor, crucified in the suburbs of Constantinople, as the murderer of his own child. For this story we are indebted to Evagrius, iv. 36.

The miracle of the confessors, who in those days spake plainly after their tongues were cut out by the persecuting Arians, is also attested by Evagrius, iv. 14. Other miracles of this kind are related in later history, and are equally improbable.

In the Chronicon Saxonicum, which is a collection of things some useful and some of small moment, we are told that pope Leo the Third was deposed by the Romans, who cut out his tongue, and pulled out his eyes, A. D. 797; and that he saw and talked after this as well as he did before. Compare this with Fleury, H. E. x. p. 22.

Agobard, archbishop of Lyons, A. D. 829, had drawn upon himself the hatred of the Jews, who were numerous

in that city, by baptizing their slaves. The Jews, says he, buy Pagan slaves; those slaves learn our language, and often take a liking to our religion, and address themselves to us, and beg to be baptized. Can we refuse them? or did the apostles use to reject such converts? We desire not to rob the masters; we are willing to redeem their slaves, and to return them the full price which they paid for them, &c.

The emperor Louis was persuaded to take part with the Jews in this affair; upon which Agobard wrote him a letter of remonstrances, which, upon the whole, seem not to be unreasonable. In this letter he charges the Jews with the crime of stealing Christian children, and selling them for slaves. Fleury, H. E. x. 319, &c.

It is observable that the popes[1] in all times have showed far more kindness and clemency to the Jews than the Christian princes. One reason was, that the court of Rome hath usually excelled all other courts in policy, craft, and worldly wisdom. It saw the folly of driving away and distressing the Jews, and it knew the use that was to be made of an industrious people, skilful in commerce and in the management of revenues; who had no particular dislike to papal authority, no disposition to assist heretics, schismatics, enemies of popery, reformers, and separatists, and no credit to make proselytes to their own religion.

'The council of Basil, held A. D. 1434, extending its pastoral care and its jurisdiction very widely, thought it proper not to overlook the Jews, who were numerous in that city, and in Germany. It ordered the prelates, in all places where there were Jews, to appoint learned divines to preach to them. The sovereign princes were obliged to send all the Jews in their dominions to attend at the sermon, and heavy penalties were to be inflicted on any person who should hide or detain them. At the same time it was forbidden to eat with them, or to keep them company. It was not lawful to have footmen, nurses, physicians, or farmers of that nation, or to let them houses near any church, or in the middle of any city: and that they might be the more easily

[1] As Gregory, at the end of the sixth century; Alexander II. A. D. 1068. Innocent III. A. D. 1198. Gregory IX. A. D. 1236. John XXII. A. D. 1320, &c.

known, they were obliged to wear a particular habit. Lastly, the council passed a condemnation, and inflicted penalties on those who should pawn to them the sacred books, crosses, chalices, and the ornaments of churches.

'The council made regulations also relating to the Jews who should receive Christianity. These converts acquired, by baptism, a right to enjoy their own possessions and goods, those excepted which they had gained by usury; for they were obliged to restore these extortions, if the persons wronged were living; and, in case of death, as the church was the mistress of these unlawful and confiscated gains, she made a present of them to the new converts. This regulation was of a singular kind; for the church hath no right to appropriate to herself the goods of particular persons, especially if they had acquired them before they entered into the church, and in the days of their ignorance; nor can she exercise it to the prejudice of the children and the heirs of those to whom restitution was due. This also was an obstacle to the conversion of the Jews, by stripping them of their acquisitions.

'The council also, by a law of its own, declared the converted Jews capable of all civil offices in the city where they were baptized, because, forsooth, *it is more noble to be born anew of the Holy Ghost than to be born of the flesh.* Councils have no business to dispose of the charges and privileges of corporations; and the reason here assigned is droll; namely, that regeneration gives men a right to temporal dignities.

'The council, after all, could not be certain of the sincerity of these proselytes, and seems to have doubted of it; for it permitted not the new converts to receive and return mutual visits, or to dwell together, knowing by experience that they only helped to spoil one another, and that their faith was rather weakened than improved by such intercourse. It also forbad them to bury their dead according to the Jewish ritual, to observe the sabbath, and other national ceremonies; a sufficient proof that these new Christians were not sincere. It ordered the curates to seek out Christian wives for these Jews, and to get them advantageous matches; and as it granted great privileges to the proselytes, it denounced terrible punishments against

dissemblers, ordering the priests to watch them narrowly, to deliver them to the inquisitors, and to make use of the secular arm, that they might be punished with the utmost rigour; declaring that they who should protect these pretended converts should be treated as friends to heretics: and carrying its authority still further, it annulled and annihilated all privileges formerly granted to the Jews, either by popes or by emperors. One is amazed to hear ecclesiastics talk at this rate,—confounding things temporal with spiritual, political with ecclesiastical, and drawing false consequences from the one to the other. With reason the council ordered that there should be care taken to instruct the Jews, and that they should be relieved by the alms of Christians; but by mere usurpation it claimed a power over emperors and imperial laws.' Basnage, Hist. des Juifs, t. v. p. 2051.

In the year 1650, the Jews, as it is said, held an assembly in the plain of Ageda in Hungary, to examine the Scriptures concerning Christ. Many of them seemed disposed to own him for the promised Messias; but upon hearing the doctrines of Christianity, as they were represented by some priests of the church of Rome who were present at the assembly, they were shocked at such idolatrous tenets, and cried out *Blasphemy*, and chose rather to reject the Gospel than to admit such a sort of Christianity.

The Narrative of these remarkable proceedings was drawn up by Samuel Bret, who was present at that synod, and is published in the Phœnix, vol. i. The question is, whether this Narrative have any more truth in it than the Adventures of Telemachus. The authors of the Acta Eruditorum declared their just suspicions concerning it—'Ceterum sunt in ea relatione nonnulla, quæ si plane dubiam fidem ejus non reddant, rerum saltem Judaicarum ignorantiæ auctorem arguant. Doctissimo certe Basnagio in erudito de Historia Judæorum opere plane illud Concilium prætermissum observamus.' 1709. p. 104.

'Many things have been reported of us that never entered into the thoughts of our nation; as I have seen a fabulous narrative of the proceedings of a great council of the Jews, assembled in the plain of Ageda, in Hungary, to determine whether the Messiah were come or no.' Manasseh Ben

Israel, in his Defense of the Jews, in the Phœnix, vol. ii. p. 401.

The account of the Jews who have been plundered, sent naked into banishment, starved, tortured, left to perish in prisons, hanged and burnt by Christians, would fill many volumes. But now they enjoy better times; they escape persecution even in some Popish countries, and those of them who dwell in Protestant nations have been well used, and no where more kindly than here; so that they have great reason to remember the command which God gave them by Jeremiah, when they were in Babylon, and to apply it to their present situation; 'Seek the peace of the city whither I have caused you to be carried, and pray unto the Lord for it; for in the peace thereof shall ye have peace.' Why should we not, in charity, suppose them to be thus inclined? for they are *men*; and men will commonly love those who treat them gently, and will certainly entertain a bad opinion of their persecutors. In this let us judge of others by what we feel ourselves; since there are two things which every honest person equally dislikes, *to oppress*, and *to be oppressed.*

If we had a circumstantial and an impartial account of all the insurrections and rebellions of the Jews, and of the causes which produced them, we should perhaps find this people to have been often provoked and exasperated by ill usage, and therefore rather less turbulent and seditious than they have been commonly represented. We should not forget that it is oppression which, usually speaking, begets rebellion; *oppression*, which, as the *wise man* observes, *will make a wise man mad.*

St. Paul, in the eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, observes, that God had rejected the Jews, and chosen the Gentiles to be his people; but, says he, this rejection of the Jews, as it is not universal, so neither is it final and irreversible; some of them are now called to the faith, but to the greater part blindness has happened, and this blindness must continue till the fulness, the more complete conversion of the Gentiles be come, and then the people of Israel shall also be saved; that is, shall be converted to the Gospel, and so be put in a state of salvation. St. Paul argues thus; If God hath called the Gentiles to his grace after a long idolatry and infidelity,

though they were never before admitted to those privileges which the Jews enjoyed, and though God had never promised to be their God for ever, much more will he recall his chosen people from their infidelity. Here we have his own authority for it, which he also strengthens by appealing to the Scriptures: 'It is written,' says he, 'The Deliverer shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob, and God shall make a covenant with his people, and take away their sins.' The Jews were called God's own people, and his first-born; to them Christ was sent, to them the apostles first preached the Gospel, and the first Christian church was that of Jerusalem, which in the primitive times was as the mother-church, and had some degree of dignity and pre-eminence over all churches.' The prophets speak of a future calling of the Jews, and of a state of stability, piety, power, happiness, glory, peace, and prosperity which they should enjoy. The expressions which are used upon this occasion are extremely strong and magnificent, and have not as yet been literally accomplished. St. John, also, in the Revelation, when he describes the New Jerusalem and the glorious state of the church, adopts the same ideas, and uses the same expressions; and therefore may be supposed to have had the same event in view: and the antient Christians, either by tradition, or by examining the Scriptures, were generally agreed in holding that the Jews should in those last days become God's people again; and in the expectation of happier times the Jews also agreed with them.

The question here is, whether St. Paul's declaration were fulfilled in the conversion of several Jews after the destruction of Jerusalem, and during the four first centuries, or whether he had a view to a still future and a much more extensive conversion. Upon this question commentators are divided; but the preservation of this people under so long, so signal, and so unexampled persecutions and calamities, would incline one to think that they are reserved for some illustrious purpose of Providence; and the expressions of St. Paul most naturally promise a conversion which is yet to come. Whitby has treated of the calling of the Jews, in his Commentary on the Eleventh Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, and in an Appendix, where the reader will find the substance of all that can be said on this side of the

question. I know of no satisfactory answer that ever was made to it.

The utmost that can be collected from the passages of Scripture concerning this great event is, that the Gospel shall, before the consummation of all things, flourish more, and extend itself further than at present; that Christianity shall be reformed, and reduced to its primitive and genuine purity and simplicity, and have a happier effect upon the manners of its professors; and that many, at least, of the Jews and Gentiles shall flow into the church.

But to descend to particulars is to indulge the most uncertain conjectures. Predictions in general, before their accomplishment, are never perfectly understood; and the metaphorical and figurative style of prophecy adds to the difficulty, and hath often misled the unwary interpreter. The expounding such sort of expressions on this occasion too literally has produced strange and precarious notions amongst antient and modern Christians concerning the *Millennium*; thus it has been supposed that Christ shall come and reign personally upon earth a thousand years; that the old Christian martyrs shall rise again to reign with him; that the Jews shall have a temple rebuilt, and a temple-service renewed; and that the righteous shall in those days enjoy the utmost temporal felicity: all which seems to agree neither with the abolishment of the ceremonial law, nor with the pure and spiritual nature of the Gospel, nor with the promises of a true happiness; which is to be expected not here below, but in the kingdom of heaven.

The conversion and the restoration of the Jews, and the calling of the Gentiles, if ever it be accomplished, must in all probability be performed by the visible manifestation of God's power and spirit, and not by ordinary and human means. This will appear, if we consider the present situation of the Jews, and of the unbelieving nations, and the impediments to their conversion, both from their own state, and from the state of Christianity.

When the Gospel was first preached, its progress was swift and extensive. If you ask why it was so, and how it came to pass, the reason is, that it was accompanied with a plentiful effusion of divine and preternatural gifts, with prophetic and miraculous powers; else it could never

have prevailed, and even the prejudices of education would have kept it out from all lands.

Christianity at present is destitute of these aids, and is to be proved by no other ways than by inferences and deductions, and moral and historical proofs, which not only require learning and the exercise of reason in the teacher, but also a tolerable capacity in the persons to be taught. Now those men in general who make up the bulk of society are incompetent judges of complicated moral evidence, and of probabilities; which makes it extremely difficult to introduce Christianity any where by mere argumentative methods, and by convincing the understanding.

The Mohammedans and Pagans are, for the most part, poor reasoners; and take up implicitly the religious opinions which they find established. Good sense and intellectual abilities are indeed natives of all climes; but they are not equally cultivated every where, and no where less than in those countries of which we are speaking, where the vulgar are often only a better sort of brutes, and a little above the monkeys. Man is in a great measure what education and instruction make him. Despotic government, which is an enemy to the free exercise of the understanding, and the danger of examining points of faith, increase the stupidity and ignorance in such places. Where the will of one insolent man is the only law, there is usually neither learning, nor courage, nor virtue, nor religion. The manners also and the customs of those nations are in some things directly contrary to the spirit of the Gospel. The Gospel restrains polygamy and divorce, enjoins chastity and humanity, orders servants or slaves to be kindly used, and the female sex to frequent the public worship of God; and therefore must be odious to those nations where different practices prevail. Hence it may be observed, that when Christianity, not long after the death of the apostles, made its way in some parts of the eastern world, it probably had the assistance of miracles; not only because of the hardships and persecutions which its professors then underwent, but because it contradicted the manners and customs of those who embraced it, and opposed itself to those indulgences and practices which men are never willing to give up, and which are to them a kind of second nature. This,

joined to some testimonies in ecclesiastical history, is no bad argument to show that miracles might continue somewhat longer than the apostolical age, and be performed upon some important occasions, particularly in preaching and establishing the Gospel amongst infidels.

There is little reason to hope that Pagan and Mohammedan nations should be converted at present by the Christians. They are not at all disposed to receive the Gospel, and to judge of the force of moral arguments and of strong probabilities. It would be a hard matter to convince them of the antiquity and the authority of our sacred books, not because our proofs are weak and defective, but because they are not acquainted with our chronology and history. Yet these impediments and difficulties are not such as should discourage the attempts made by our teachers and missionaries amongst the Pagans in those countries where we have commerce and settlements. Such attempts are highly useful and commendable, and deserve public encouragement; and surely it is the duty of Christians, when they have means and opportunities, to relieve the spiritual no less than the corporal wants of their fellow-creatures.

The Jews are dispersed over the earth, and dwell in Mohammedan, in Pagan, and in Christian countries: so that, though by descent they be Jews, by birth they are Persians, Turks, Italians, &c. and partake in some measure of the genius and temper of the nations in which they are born and educated. By dwelling amongst Pagans and Mohammedans, and under tyrannical government, they learn to reason as little as their masters and their neighbours, and to go on implicitly in the faith of their forefathers. Their neighbours never dispute much about religion; and it is controversy and free debate that opens and enlarges the mind and improves the understanding; without this there is a dull stagnation of the intellectual faculties.

Besides this, the Jews were never remarkable for accurate and methodical reasoning; and their traditionary doctrines and mystical interpretations help to spoil their judgment.

'R. Falk began A. D. 1530 to exercise his scholars in dispute, after the manner of the Christians: but this method did not please the wise, and was not generally approved. The Jews, who have a theology altogether my-

stical, and depending more upon the imagination than upon reasoning, have no taste for arguments and syllogisms.' Basnage, Hist. des Juifs, l. vii. c. 30. p. 2072.

The Jews, in countries where Christianity is not established, lie out of the way of receiving instruction, if they were willing to hearken to it. Who should teach them? The Christians who dwell in those parts are poor, ignorant, superstitious, slavish men, and sometimes dishonest men also, and not qualified for preachers of the Gospel: so that the conversion of the Jews cannot, in all appearance, begin in those regions.

The Jews dispersed in Christian countries dwell either in Popish or in Protestant nations. There is not the least probability that the Papists should ever convert them. The violence which a man must offer to his own senses and reason, and the slavish deference that he must pay to human authority, before he can enter into that communion; the divine honours given to the Virgin Mary; the worship of angels, saints, crosses, wafers, coffins, bones, rags, old iron, reliques, pictures, and images, supported by ridiculous miracles and traditionary lies; the tyranny of the church, and the cruelty of the inquisition; these are insuperable obstructions to the conversion of the Jews, and excite in them prejudices against Christianity that are too strong and too plausible to be easily removed. The Jews abhor idolatry, and every thing that borders upon it; and in Popish countries they have no notion of any other Christianity than what is there professed, and what they see before them.

The Jews who dwell in Protestant countries have not the same causes to dislike Christianity, which appears with more simplicity, which offers itself fairly to examination, which is purged from superstitious practices, and which forces itself upon no one with imperious insolence. But even in the reformed nations too many obstacles remain to prevent and discourage the conversion of that people; such as arise from the little influence which the Gospel is observed to have upon the lives and manners of many of its professors; from the disunion of Christians, and their division and subdivision into various sects, which usually entertain no favourable opinion of each other.

If I should embrace Christianity, a Jew might say, I have just begun the laborious inquiry: it remains to consider to whom I should join myself, and here I am quite perplexed with your divisions.

If I should go over to the church of Rome, the Protestants will condemn my judgment, and say that I have made a miserable choice; if I become a Protestant, the Papists will tell me I might as well have remained a Jew; schismatics and heretics are, in their opinion, in as bad a situation, and as much excluded from salvation as Jews, Mohammedans, Deists, Sceptics, and Atheists: if I be a Protestant of this or that denomination, other sects of Protestants will blame me, and think me still in a dangerous condition, and perhaps call me a schismatic.

Thus some Jews have reasoned: and that we may not be thought to have furnished them with objections which we cannot answer, let us offer a short reply. It might then be said to the Jew: Search the Scriptures, and examine our arguments; and if they convince you, receive the Gospel, and believe in Christ. You are then his subject and his servant; for it is not your belonging to this or that church that makes you a Christian, but your belief that Jesus is the Son of God, and the Messias. The rest you may do at your leisure, and it is not so laborious a task as you suspect. Only consider what the church of Rome and what the Protestant churches require of you, and judge which is the most reasonable, and the most conformable to the New Testament. The church of England, in her form of *baptism of those of riper years*, requires of you only an assent to the Christian religion in general, and to the apostles' creed in particular.

Another impediment to the conversion of the Jews is, that in the Christian world there is much indifference and coldness towards religion, much dissoluteness of manners, and dishonesty; that amongst us many Sceptics, Deists, and Infidels are also to be found, who have deserted the faith in which they were educated. We may suppose, without any breach of charity, that in these respects the Jews are not better than the Christians, nor free from the same faults; that they have their doubters, and their unbelievers, besides those who mind nothing except the cares and concerns and

vanities and diversions of this world, that they and we go, *one to his farm, and another to his merchandise*, whilst the prophets are little regarded by the Jew, and the apostles by the Christian.

Another great and well-known difficulty in the conversion of the Jews (as also of the Mohammedans) is the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, which they have always been taught to look upon as not reconcileable with the unity of God. All that I shall say to this is, that no one should attempt to remove this prejudice, and to satisfy them upon this subject, till he has brought them to believe the divine mission of Jesus Christ, and his character as Prophet, Messias, Teacher of Truth, and Worker of Miracles. If they will not admit the things relating to his offices and ministry, it would be a vain and useless undertaking to debate with them about the dignity of his nature. And when it is necessary to proceed to that part of Christianity, this doctrine should be represented even as it is delivered in the New Testament, and no otherwise; and then many things may be observed concerning the Λόγος, the *angel of God's presence*, and the *angel of the covenant*, from the Old Testament, and from Philo, and from some antient Jewish writers. It will also be well worth the while to consider how the oldest Christian apologist now extant hath reasoned with the Jews upon this subject, as also how Limborch managed that part of the controversy with Orobius. What right hath a modern controvertist to require more from a Jew than Justin Martyr required from Trypho? I might say, than the apostles and first preachers required from those whom they converted, when they admitted them to baptism? 'And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest (be baptized). And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.'

'Hic autem ita me gessi, ut nullius peculiaris inter Christianos controversi dogmatis, sed solius evangelii patrocinium susceperim: secutus judicium viri summi et religionis Christianæ patroni ac vindicis omnium calculo prudentissimi ac strenuissimi, Hugonis Grotii, qui in aureo suo et nunquam satis laudato De veritate religionis Christianæ tractatu, non

tantum eandem disputandi rationem observavit; sed et in epistola quadam ad Gerardum Joannem Vossium hanc instituti sui rationem reddit: *Triados probationem in eo libro directe aggressus non sum, memor ejus quod a viro magno socero tuo audiveram, peccasse Plessæum et alios, quod rationibus a natura petitis, et Platonicis, sæpe non appositis, testimoniis, adstruere voluissent rem non ponendam in illa cum Atheis, Paganis, Judæis, Mahumethistis disputatione, qui omnes ad sacras literas ducendi sunt, ut inde talia hauriant, quæ nisi Deo semet patefaciente cognosci nequeunt.* Hinc quotiescunque Judæus ad dogmata quibusdam Christianis peculiaria, qualia plura in ipsius scripto occurrunt, me pertrahere conatus est, ego studiose id declinavi; ratus, contra hominem Novi Testamenti auctoritatem negantem frustra disputari de dogmatibus alibi aut non, aut saltem non clare revelatis, quorum proinde fides divinam Novi Testamenti autoritatem præsupponit; ac proinde sufficere, ut contra Judæum sola evangelii divinitas adstruatur, de qua siquis argumentorum pondere convictus sit, eadem opera omnium quæ evangelium tradit dogmatum veritas ac divinitas ipsi comprobata erit: quâ semel comprobatâ, ipse porro attenta adhibita Novi Testamenti lectione, omnibusque in timore Domini legitime examinatis, dijudicare poterit, quid de dogmatibus inter Christianos controversis consentanee veritati in Novo Testamento traditæ statuendum sit.' Limborch. Præfat.

'Tandem concludit vir doctus, quod *propheta, qui in seipsum ut verum Deum Israelis fidem exegerit, qui Dei omnipotentiam sibi arrogaverit, qui verba sua ut a se præcepta, populo indixerit, admitti non debet; et dato impossibili, quod Messias, quem Judæi expectant, eam doctrinam Israelem edoceret, jure foret ut pseudopropheta lapidandus.* Sed ego jam isti illationi occurri, quod Jesus Christus semper se Patris legatum et filium prædicet, et in se, ut talem, fidem exigat. Neque ulterius quicquam, ut necessario credendum, evangelium exigit. Si qui plura ad salutem creditu necessaria decrevere, eorum decretis non teneor, qui solam Scripturam sacram unicam fidei meæ regulam agnosco. Ex illa itaque vir doctissimus, ut aliquoties monui, contra me argumentari debet: non ex doctrinis, de quibus inter Christianos disputatur, et quarum fidem Scrip-

tura nusquam sub admittendæ salutis pœna exigit.' Respons. p. 296.

As miracles were the great instrument to convert the Jews and Gentiles in the apostolical age, so the absence of them at present must needs be a disadvantage, as far as the propagation of Christianity is concerned.

The Jews will say, If the miracles recorded in your sacred books were really wrought, our ancestors were inexcusable in rejecting Christianity; but these are transactions of remote antiquity, and we cannot be charged at present with resisting such evidence. If it should please God to enable you to show us the like wonders, you should find us more compliant. In the mean time we choose to adhere to a religion which you, as well as we, hold to have been of divine original. These arguments are not conclusive; but, as they are not destitute of a plausible appearance, prejudiced persons will not easily give them up.

Thus the conversion of the Jews seems to be removed to a distant day: but the Scriptures, as we observed, give us reasons to expect it; and this expectation is much confirmed by the wonderful preservation of that people.

If therefore there be a time in the decrees of Providence, when many who sit in darkness shall be enlightened, when the everlasting Gospel shall be more generally known and received, and the Jews shall be called to partake of this blessing, it is to be supposed that the present obstructions to it will be removed, and in particular those which arise from Popery. Popery is the most degenerate form of Christianity that can be conceived, and lays a heavier yoke upon the necks of Christians than the Scribes and the Pharisees ever imposed upon the Jews. It is a religion which can never make its way but by cruelty and tyranny, by gibbets and inquisitions, nor be supported but by self-interest and ignorance; and yet, as it is received by many great and polite, learned and flourishing nations, it seems at present secure from ruin. But the smaller hope and the remoter prospect there is of the extinction of this tyranny, the more remarkable and the more providential will the downfall of it appear to all the world, if ever it happen, and strike Jews and Mohammedans and Gentiles with amazement, and prepare the way for their conversion.

The next step towards the increase of Christ's kingdom must be a further improvement of Christianity, and of those who receive and profess it. The church of Rome is not the only church that wants amendment. Other Christian societies which have separated themselves from her, and from her grosser defects, are departed more or less from the original simplicity of the Gospel, and have mixed some doctrines of men with the word of God, and so stand in need of some improvement.

It is therefore to be hoped that a time will come when religion will have a fairer and a more alluring aspect; when Christians will be united, not in opinion as to all theological points, for that is impossible whilst men are men, but that they will be united in benevolence and charity, in intercommunion, and in one *common and simple profession of faith*; that their manners will be suitable to their profession, and that they will be more peaceable, more virtuous, and more pious; and then the external impediments to the conversion of unbelievers will in no small measure be removed. These are amendments which seem, besides human efforts, to require such a concurrence of favourable circumstances as scarcely ever meet and are united, together with supernatural aids, and an effusion of divine gifts and graces. Therefore, it may be said, such a change, such a regeneration of mankind is not to be expected. And yet strange things have been accomplished. Who, that had seen the dreadful destruction of Jerusalem, could have thought that the Jewish nation, so enfeebled, so dispersed, so abhorred, and so oppressed in all places, would have subsisted for seventeen hundred years? Who that had beheld the beginnings of Christianity, and the difficulties which it had to encounter, would have imagined that it should spread through the known world? Who that had seen a poor monk set his face against popes and emperors, would have believed that the preaching of Luther should have brought about a reformation, and the establishment of the Protestant religion?

Nothing is too hard for Omnipotence: great and glorious changes, even a *new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness*, may be produced by instruments and by methods of which we are now ignorant, and which it is vain to seek out by

conjectures. These *secret things* belong to the Lord our God, and to him we must leave them. Our duty is to do all that lies in our power towards increasing his dominion, by studying to understand his Gospel, by a sober care and concern to live suitably to its holy precepts, and by not only wishing and praying, but endeavouring that his kingdom may come, and his will be done on earth as it is in heaven.

In this third volume, the Remarks on Ecclesiastical History are brought down to the death of Constantine, to the year 337. And here the author begs leave to detain the readers, in two or three pages, with a subject, which, though it may seem only to concern himself, yet he cannot well pass over in silence.

When he had the favour of being appointed to preach Boyle's Lectures, he drew up a plan for his Discourses, under these four heads:

I. Remarks on the being and perfections of God, and particularly on his impartiality and his goodness.

II. The nature, use, and intent of prophecy, together with an examination of some predictions in the Old and in the New Testament.

III. Considerations on miracles in general, on the miracles of Christ and his apostles, and on the support which they give to the Christian religion.

IV. The law of Moses and the Jewish religion set in a proper light, and defended from some objections antient and modern.

The substance of his Discourses, upon the *second* and the *third* head, is inserted in these Remarks on Ecclesiastical History.

The noble and prudent *Donation* of our *Christian philosopher* hath had suitable effects, and hath produced a *printed* collection of *Religious Lectures*, which in the main may be called learned and judicious, though they be not all of equal value.

The subject is copious; but a succession of hands will at length exhaust the most copious theme, and unavoidably occasion a repetition of the same thoughts and arguments, somewhat diversified in method and in style.

This, and the present cool demand for printed sermons,

may induce the lecturers to content themselves with preaching, and to abstain from publishing.

But yet, if this fashion should obtain, there may be reason to fear that, in process of time, Mr. Boyle's will have the same fate (though they deserve a better) with some other *lectures*, and become mere *wall-lectures*, and discourses calculated to exist for half an hour.

Between the two methods of publishing *all* or *none*, there seems to be a third, by which the Discourses, being stripped of every thing popular, trite, and redundant, may be thrown into the more learned and the more contracted form of *Dissertation*. This is the method which the author hath attempted, and which he takes the liberty to mention: not pretending in the least to dictate, and to prescribe laws, or even to offer advice to his successors; but only to make an apology for his own conduct, and to inform the public, which hath a right to ask and to know, how he hath endeavoured to execute a trust of a public nature committed to his care.

APPENDIX.

EUSEBII PRÆPARATIO EVANGELICA.

THE *Præparatio* and the *Demonstratio Evangelica* of Eusebius are, like the rest of his works, useful and valuable treatises, and deserve a better edition, especially the former, in which are preserved many curious fragments of antient writers. It is, says Fabricius, 'collectio pulcherrima argumentorum, variorumque notatu dignissimorum monumentorum ac testimoniorum ex scriptoribus externis magnam partem hodie deperditis, qua animus lectoris præparetur ad demonstrationes de veritate evangelii Christi ex sacris literis tanto facilius imbibendas admittendasque.'

III. 14.

Mercury says;

Ὃς δ' ἐγὼ, ὃν καλέεις, Ζηνὸς καὶ Μαιάδος υἱὸς,
Ἑρμῆς προβέβηκα, λιπὼν ἀστραῖον ἄνακτα.

'Mercurius, quem voce vocas, Maiæque Jovisque
Filius, huc veni, cælesti rege relicto.'

Vigerus reads Ἑρμῆς ὃς—Perhaps:

Ὧδ' ἐγὼ, ὃν καλέεις, Ζηνὸς καὶ Μαιάδος υἱὸς,
ΕΡΜΕΙΑΣ προβέβηκα—

Observe that in these oracles the gods themselves are supposed to speak.

V. 7.

An oracle of Apollo Didymæus begins thus:

Μητέρι μὲν μακάρων μέλεται Τιτηνίδι Ῥείῃ
Αὐλοὶ, καὶ τυμπάνων πάταγοι, καὶ θῆλυς ὅμιλος.

'Rhea beatorum mater reginaque Divûm
Fœmineos cœtus, buxum, et vocalia tractat
Tympana.'

Apollo stole this from the Hymn in Matrem Deorum, which is called Homer's:

Ἥι κροτάλων, τυπάνων τ' ἰαχὴ, σύν τε τρόμος αὐλῶν
Ἔυαδεν.

'Cui crotalorum, tympanorumque sonus, simulque strepitus tibiarum
Placuit.'

In the oracle we ought to read, not τυμπάνων with a vowel made short before μπ, but τυπάνων, as in the Hymn to Cybele, τυπάνων τ' ἰαχὴ, with Barnes and others. So in the Atys of Catullus 8.

'Niveis citata cepit manibus leve *typanum*,
Typanum tubam Cybelles, tua, Mater, initia.'

Apollonius, Arg. 1.

Ῥόμβῳ καὶ ΤΥΠΑΝΩι Ῥείην Φρύγες ἱλάσκονται.

The rule is this: When a vowel is made short before two consonants, those consonants must be such as can begin a syllable, as κυ-κνος, &c. If any poets have violated this rule, of which there are some instances, it is a fault in them, and no examples can justify it.

Θῆλυς ὅμιλος, in the oracle, which Vigerus renders *cœtus fœmineus*, is *grex semivirorum*, the *Galli*, the castrated priests or servants of Cybele, who were vagabonds, thieves, beggars, and most infamous wretches. The priests of Isis, &c. used to carry their deities about to ask alms;

upon which Tertullian says very prettily, that the Christians could not afford to relieve begging men and begging gods too: 'Non enim sufficimus et hominibus, et Diis vestris mendicantibus opem ferre.' Apol. 42.

Van Dale would distinguish between the *Galli*, and the *priests* of this goddess; and supposes the *Galli* to have been rascals of a lower rank.

V. 8.

An oracle of Hecate:

Ἠέριον μετὰ * φέγγος ἀπείριτον, ἀστεροπληθὲς,
Ἄχραντον πολὺ δῶμα θεοῦ λίπον· ἡ δ' ἐπιβαίνω
Γαίης ζωοτρόφοιο, τεῆς ὑποθημοσύνῃσι,
Πειθοῖ τ' ἀῤῥήτων ἐπέων, οἷς δὴ φρένα τέρπει
Ἀθανάτων ἀδαὴ θνητὸς βροτός.

'Aëriam lucem, et magni stellantia cœli
Culmina, divinos linquo sanctosque penates,
Telluremque peto, quo me tua dicta vocarunt,
Visque arcana precum traxit, queis Numina linguæ
Mortali mulcere datur.'

Perhaps it should be thus:

Ἠέριον ΚΑΤΑ φέγγος ἀπείριτον, ἀστερεπληθὲς,
Ἄχραντον πολὺ δῶμα ΘΕΩΝ λίπον, ΗΔ' ἐπιβαίνω
Γαίης ζωοτρόφοιο, τεῆσ' ὑποθημοσύνῃσι,
Πειθοῖ τ' ἀῤῥήτων ἐπέων, οἷς δὴ φρένα ΤΕΡΠΕΙΝ
Ἀθανάτων ΕΔΑΗ θνητὸς βροτός.

Vigerus corrects κατὰ and τέρπειν. The rest is mine; θεῶν for θεοῦ. ἠδ' for ἡ δ', ἐδάη *novit* for ἀδαῆ. Vigerus conjectures ἔαδε *placuit*; which is wrong, and makes a barbarism in the construction. It should be translated:

——— 'queis pectora Divûm
Mortalis mulcere potest.'

* Quid si μέγα φέγγος—says a friend of mine.

V. 23.

Oenomaus complains that when he himself consulted Apollo on some very important affair, and desired his direction, he received this impertinent answer: Ἐκ τανυστρόφοιο λάας σφενδόνης ἰεὶς ἀνὴρ, χῆνας ἐναρίζε βουλαῖσιν ἀσπέτους, ποιηβόρους. 'Gyrovagâ lapides fundâ excutiens, anseres prudenter interfice immensos, herbivoros.'

There is no occasion to make Apollo talk more foolishly than he did; therefore we will try to mend his discourse a little. Vigerus, the editor of Eusebius, did not perceive that these were trochaics; and that instead of βουλαῖσιν, *consiliis*, it should be βολαῖσιν, *ictibus*.

Ἐκ τανυστρόφοιο λάας σφενδόνης ἰεὶς, ἀνὴρ,
Χῆνας ἐνάριζε βολαῖσιν ἀσπέτους, ποιηβόρους.

Ἐνάριζε. For the sake of metre we may read ἐναρίζου, from ἐναρίζομαι, or ἐνάρισον, from ἐναρίζω, or, which is better, ἐναρίζειν, *interficere*, by way of *ellipsis*, with *incipe*, *conare*, or some such verb understood. By this most ridiculous oracle, Oenomaus was advised to 'go and kill geese, by flinging stones at them out of a sling.'

By a certain anomaly and irregularity, the Greeks sometimes put the *infinitive* for the *imperative*. 'Alia est phrasis, apud Græcos usitatissima, cujus exemplum est apud Herodotum, iv. c. 163, ubi *infinitivus* est loco *imperativi*: σὺ μέν τοι ἥσυχος εἶναι κατελθὼν εἰς τὴν σεωυτοῦ, ad verbum, *tu quidem quietus esse redux in patriam.* Sic et apud Homerum, Il. i. 255.

σὺ δὲ μεγαλήτορα θυμὸν
Ἴσχειν ἐν στήθεσσι.

Tu magnanimum animum habere in pectore. Vide et vers. 281. 'Non potest subaudiri δεῖ *oportet*, quod alioqui subaudiri in ea phrasi solet, quia antecessit σὺ tu. Ne dixeris etiam subaudiendum μέμνησο *memento*; nam apud Hesiodum in hoc versu, ubi hæc ipsa est loquutio, verbum hoc intelligi nequit.' Oper. et Dier. 616.

ἀρότου μεμνημένος εἶναι
Ὡραίου.

'*Memor esse arationis tempestivæ*, nemo enim dixerit *memento memor esse*.' Vide vers. 623 et 641. Clericus, Art. Crit. t. i. p. 252.

But I believe that Le Clerc is a little mistaken, and that all these *anomalies* of the Greek language are *elliptical* forms of speech, and capable of being supplied one way or other; and in Hesiod, though you cannot say, *remember to remember*, μέμνησο μεμνημένος εἶναι; yet you may say, *take care to remember*, Φυλάττου μεμνημένος εἶναι.

As we are upon the subject of Oracles, I shall produce two from Socrates the historian, which want emendation. H. E. iii. 23. p. 204.

1. The Rhodians, being under some calamity, and consulting an oracle, received this answer:

Ἄττιν ἱλάσκεσθαι, θεὸν μέγαν, ἁγνὸν Ἄδωνιν,
Εὔβιον, ὀλβιόδωρον, εὐπλόκαμον Διόνυσον.

'Attin Deum magnum placate, purum Adonim,
Bonæ vitæ et felicitatis largitorem, pulchra coma præditum Bacchum.'

I wonder how Valesius could let such lines pass uncorrected. This *Atys* is so differently spelt and declined, that we cannot determine whether it should be Ἄτην, or Ἄττιν, or Ἄττῖν', or Ἄτυν, or Ἄττυν, or something else. We may read,

Ἄτην ΙΛΑΣΚΕΣΘΕ, θεὸν μέγαν, ἁγνὸν Ἄδωνιν.

2. The Delphic Oracle, in complaisance to Alexander the Great, made him a god.

Ζῆνα θεῶν ὕπατον, καὶ Ἀθηνᾶν Τριτογένειαν
Τιμᾶτε βροτέων ἐν σώματι κρυπτὸν ἄνακτα,
Ὃν Ζεὺς ἀρίσταις γυναιξὶ ἔσπειρεν ἀρωγὸν
Εὐνομίης θνητοῖσιν Ἀλέξανδρον βασιλῆα.

'Jovem Deum summum et Minervam Tritogeniam
Colite in mortali corpore absconditum regem,
Quem felici satu genuit Jupiter, vindicem
Justitiæ mortalibus Alexandrum regem.'

Worship, said the priestess, Jupiter, and his daughter Minerva, and his son Alexander. It should be,

Ζῆνα θεῶν ὕπατον, καὶ Ἀθηνᾶν Τριτογένειαν
Τιμᾶτε, ΒΡΟΤΕΩι Τ' ἐν σώματι κρυπτὸν ἄνακτα,
Ὃν Ζεὺς ΑΡΡΗΤΟΙΣΙ γοναῖς ἔσπειρεν—

ἀῤῥήτοισι is the emendation of Valesius.

IX.

In this book Eusebius hath inserted several lines of a miserable Jewish bard, called Ezechiel Tragicus, which deserved not the honour of being transcribed. Clemens Alexandrinus hath also regaled his readers with some of them, Strom. i. p. 414. and Fabricius gives an account of this Ezechiel, Bibl. Gr. i. p. 679. His verses are very faulty, either through his own ignorance and stupidity, or from injuries done to him by the librarians.

Many of the lines might easily be mended; but upon such an author the labour would be ill bestowed. 'In scowring an asse's head,' says somebody, 'nothing is lost, except soap and pains.' But soap and pains are too good to be thrown away.

Gentianus Hervetus thought him an elegant poet: De la Monnoye, a man of better taste, speaks of him with the contempt which he deserves; and supposes that he wrote in the first or second century. Huetius places him a hundred years at least before Christ. It is no great matter when he lived: but I should imagine him to be at least a hundred years older than Clemens Alexandrinus, who cites him, and who flourished towards the end of the second century. See Baillet, Jug. des Savans, t. iv. p. 199.

X. 10.

—κατακλυσμοί τε, καὶ ἐκπυρώσεις, Προμηθεὺς, Ἰὼ, Εὐρώπη, * Σπαρτοὶ, Κόρης ἁρπαγὴ—' diluvia, incendia, Prometheus, Io, Europa, * Proserpinæ raptus'—

They are the words of Africanus, who is speaking of the Greek mythology. Σπαρτοὶ, 'Supplendum credo, vel ὀδόντες, vel στρατιῶται, vel aliquid simile. Omnino enim post Europam, de Cadmo, Cadmique militibus ex Draconis dentibus repente satis, locutus videtur.'

So Vigerus, who saw the meaning of the place, but was mistaken in thinking it wanted emendation; for the soldiers who sprang from the Dragon's teeth are called Σπαρτοὶ by the Greeks, and *Sparti* by the Latins. See Hyginus, Fab. 178. and Munker.

XI. 31.

Eusebius, and the Fathers in general, were of opinion that Plato borrowed several things from Moses and the prophets; but the proofs which they produce are usually by no means conclusive and satisfactory.

He says here, Τῆς Ἑβραίων γραφῆς ἐφ' ἑκάστῳ δημιουργημάτων ἐπιφωνούσης, Καὶ εἶδεν ὁ Θεὸς, ὅτι καλόν· καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ πάντων συγκεφαλαιώσει φασκούσης, Καὶ εἶδεν ὁ Θεὸς τὰ πάντα, καὶ ἰδοὺ, καλὰ λίαν. Ἄκουε τοῦ Πλάτωνος λέγοντος, Εἰ μὲν δὴ καλός ἐστιν ὅδε ὁ κόσμος, ὅ, τε δημιουργὸς ἀγαθὸς, δῆλον ὡς πρὸς τὸ ἀΐδιον ἔβλεπε. Καὶ πάλιν, Ὁ μὲν γὰρ κάλλιστος τῶν γεγονότων, ὁ δ' ἄριστος τῶν αἰτίων. 'Quum etiam, ut quodque perfectum erat divinum opus, hanc sacræ literæ clausulam identidem adjecerint, *Et vidit Deus quod bonum esset:* itemque ut simul omnia comprehenderent, *Et vidit Deus omnia, et ecce valdè bona erant:* Platonem audi sic loquentem, *Atqui si bonus est hic mundus, si bonus ejusdem artifex, profecto speciem æternitatis imitari maluit.* Atque iterum, *Nam uti mundus omnium quæ condita sunt optimus est, ita Deus artificum omnium optimus.*'

Surely a Pagan philosopher might say that the world was

'The fairest offspring of the fairest mind,'

without having seen the books of Moses. Eusebius might have produced a passage more remarkable, and more to his purpose, from Plato's Timæus, p. 37, where it is said, that when God saw the world which he had made, begin to live and move, he was greatly pleased. Ὡς δὲ κινηθέν τε αὐτὸ καὶ ζῶν ἐνενόησε τῶν αἰδίων θεῶν γεγονὸς ἄγαλμα ὁ γεννήσας Πατὴρ, ἠγάσθη τε καὶ εὐφρανθεὶς—' Postquam igitur universi Pater atque progenitor opus illud a se creatum animadvertisset et moveri et vivum esse, Deorum immortalium, natum tamen atque creatum simulacrum, mirum in modum gavisus est atque oblectatus illo suo opere.' To which we may add the fable of Jupiter, mentioned by some mythologist, that when he was born, he laughed for seven days together.

Socrates, in the Phædo, relates μῦθον καλὸν, an elegant history, concerning an earth altogether resplendent and beautiful, adorned with the brightest colours, whose rocks and solid parts were all precious stones, and exhibited σάρδιά τε καὶ ἰάσπιδας καὶ σμαράγδους—

Eusebius might have also compared this narrative with Isaiah liv.—' I will lay thy stones with fair colours, and thy foundations with sapphires, and will make thy gates of carbuncles,' &c.

Ezekiel xxviii. ' In Eden, the garden of God, every precious stone was thy covering, the sardius, topaz and diamond, the sapphire, the jasper,' &c.

Whence Tobit says, xiii. that Jerusalem should be built with ' sapphires, emeralds, precious stones,' &c.; and St. John, Rev. xxi. saw her descend from heaven, thus adorned with every precious stone.

And yet I would not venture to affirm that Plato was acquainted with the Scriptures, but leave it as a moot point.

XV. 22.

We have here a dissertation of Plotinus, in which that philosopher proves very well that the soul is an immaterial, simple, indivisible substance.

XV. 62.

After an account of the various disagreeing opinions of the learned Pagans, Eusebius concludes with some lines of Timon Phliasius, who wrote satires called Silli, in which he ridiculed the vain and violent contentions of the philosophers. These poems were a species of the *burlesque*, and consisted of verses taken from Homer, and, with small alterations, accommodated and applied to the subject.

Τίς γὰρ τούσδ' ὁλοῇ ἔριδι ξυνέηκε μάχεσθαι;
Ἠχοῦς σύνδρομος ὄχλος· ὁ γὰρ σιωπῶσι χολωθείς,
Νοῦσον ἐπ' ἀνέρας ὦρσε λάλην, ὀλέκοντο δὲ πολλοί.

*

Φοιτᾷ δὲ βροτολοιγὸς Ἔρις κενὸν λελακυῖα,
Νείκης ἀνδροφόνοιο κασιγνήτη καὶ ἑταίρη,
Ἣ τ' ὀλαὴ περὶ πάντα κυλίνδεται· αὐταὰρ ἔπειτα
Ἐς βρίθος ἐστήριξε κάρη, καὶ ἐς ἐλπίδα βάλλει.

'Ecquis eos diro pugnæ inflammavit amore?
Concurrens linguæ fremitus: namque ille silentum
Impatiens, morbi contagia fœda loquacis
Immisit: sævo multi periere veneno.

*

'Dira lues hominum, Contentio, vanaque jactans,
Mortiferique soror Belli, Pugnæque ministra,
Invadit, cæcoque diu rapta impete, tandem
Confirmat gravitate caput, spemque objicit ultro.'

These verses are also to be found in Clemens Alex. Strom. v. p. 651, with some variation.

v. 2. The first and second syllables of σιωπῶσι coalesce. In Clemens σιγῶσι.

4. Φοιτᾷ. Perhaps Φοίτα. But the present tense may be right.

κενὸν. Read κενεὸν from Clemens.

λελακυῖα, with the second syllable short. Hesiod has

Δαιμονίη, τί λέλακας;—

with the second syllable long. Oper. et Dier. 207.

5. ἔριτος. in Clemens ἔριδος. At least, it should be ἔριστος. But this, though it mend the verse, will not mend the bad sense; for how can Ἔρις be the sister of herself? Perhaps,

Νείκης ἀνδροφόνοιο κασιγνήτη, καὶ ἑταίρη.

As in Homer, Il. Δ. 441.

Ἄρεος ἀνδροφόνοιο κασιγνήτη, ἑτάρη τε.

If the rest were like this specimen, the loss of it is not to be regretted. In this sort of wit, in *parodies*, the moderns have infinitely surpassed the antients, who have, I think, only *one* ingenious poem of this kind; but that poem hath a fault which spoils all its beauties, and is scandalously obscene. It is no matter whose it is, or where it is to be found.

THE END OF THE SECOND VOLUME,

CONTAINING

THE SECOND AND THIRD VOLUMES OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

R. Taylor and Co. Printers,
38, *Shoe Lane, Fleet Street.*